IN

S C

A Survey

With a

D. Cawdry

at Billing

MUSEUM
BRITANNICUM

To the Reader.

How unpleasing and distastfull the undertaking of the following Rejoynder was, and is, to me; not onely God, and mine own conscience, but also some speciall friends, can witnesse for me: And that the rather, because I cannot (if I would not wrong my Cause, and my self) but discover some personall weaknesses, or forgetfulnesse of my reverend Adversary, upon his denyals of some things, which (if there be any truth in reports) were known to be true. I could have heartily wished, that the reverend Doctor had taken more time, "than the spare "hours of four or five daies,

"when he was preſſed with "more then ordinary occaſions "of ſundry ſorts; and deferred the examination of mine till fur-ther leaſure, when his ſpirit was more ſedate and ſerious; For I perceive, he was in ſome paſſion, (which quickned that haſte) at my Tract, comming out at that time, (a little before the publick Act) and that did caſt a miſt upon his judgement and memory, which cauſed this abortive birth. I conjectured by his Epiſtle, what I might expect in his Treatiſe, the heads whereof were theſe: "1. My manifold miſtakes. "2. My preſumptions, upon my "own principles. 3. My caſting "reproaches on them, with "whom I had to do, &c. All which are anſwered in my following Diſcourſe, and therefore ſpared here. One thing he prepoſſeſſes his Reader with; "That he expect "not any thing from this Tract,

"but

but what is necessary, for the refutation of the Book, whereinto it is opposed; *which is least of all performed.* Complaints there are good store, *of* personall *wrongs, many times repeated, from one end of the Book to the other; but little or nothing said to the* vindication *of his Cause, against the Argumentative part of mine; as many others have observed. He further saies;* He forbears all re-charge on the Presbyterian way; as to the differences in judgment and practise among themselves, which are more and greater, then any this Author hath found amongst them. *Truly it cannot be denyed, but there are too many* differences *amongst us, in judgment and practice, (who caused them, I forbear to say) but with this difference, from them and theirs, that ours are betwixt man and man, one man and another;*

theirs

theirs are in one and the same man, differing from, and contradicting himself, in a short space of time, as hath been made appear else-where. Another thing he would have his Reader expect, (the waiting for which, hath caused this delay of mine, at least in part) "A vindi-"cation of Mr. J. C. from some "unjust (so he calls them) impu-"tations of mine. Truly there was nothing imputed to him, but his inconstancy in his opinions, and self-contradictions, (as now to the reverend Doctor) out of his own Writings. I heard of that Discourse *above three years since, in the hands of one of the* Brethren; *and intended then, by him, to be published (as it is now promised, or rather* threatned, *by the reverend Doctor) to cast a* slurre *upon me, (as it is thought) which why it is thus long silenced, I will not conjecture. One I wish those, that intend to* rake *in*

the

e ashes of the Dead, to consider, hether they shall deserve any anks for their labour. I have no ore to say to his Epistle, referring e rest to the Tract it self. Farewell, nd love Truth as well as Peace.

Errata.

PAge 9. line 4. *à fine*, read propagate. p. 8. l. 15. r. that. p: 12. l. 5. for them, r. him. p. 13. l. last, r. invented. p. 38. l. 5. *à fine*, r. Anabap. p. 41. l. 2. *à fine* for easie, r. case. p. 50. l. 11. *à fine* after *not*, put in *at*. p. 52. l. 17. after *said*, put, *in*. p. 55. l. 2. after *brand*, put in *our*. *Ibid.* l. 3. after *is*, put in (*no.*) p. 71. l. 5. for singular, r. signifie. *Ib.* l. 8. *à fine*, r. secession. p. 72. *Matth.* 18. in Marg. that Note should have stood higher, about the middle. p. 73. l. 3. *à fine* after *to*, put in *be*. p. 166. l. 10. r. exceptions. p. 109. l. 8. *à fine*, r. formally and the same; l. 3. *à fine*. p. 111. l. 1. for his, read this.

Independency further proved to be a Schism.

OR,

A Survey of Dr. Owen's Review of his Treat. of Schism.

CHAP. I.

IT is very true, which the reverend Doctor saies; "That "considering the "various interests "of Parties at difference, there is "no great successe to be promised, by "the management of controversies, "though with never so much evidence "and conviction of truth. The present Sectaries of all sorts, give a sad instance of this, not one of a thousand being reclaimed from their errours, by the clearest demonstrations of truth, but rather "growing worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived, as the

Apostle did foretell us. There are therefore *other ends* propounded to themselves, by those that undertake them, "As the rendring an homage to the "truth, the safegarding of some weaker "professors, from the sophisms and "violence of adversaries, &c. Which its well, if they can & do attain. How little successe the reverend Doctor expected, he told us in his former Treatise of *Schism*, and now again professes, (as well he might, upon such principles) "That he was so far from hoping, to "see speedily any visible fruits, of the "efficacy of the truth, he had managed, "that he promised himself a vigorous "opposition; onely, he was not able "to conjecture, from what hand the "first assault of it would arise. That is, Whether from *Papists*, *Episcopals*, or *Presbyterians*. The truth is, he hath given them all a *provocation*, to an opposition, by his *new notion* of Schism, (beside others) and I a little wonder, that none other have done it, unless it be upon the old Maxim, *Contra negantem principia non est disputandum*. The notion of *schism*, in the *nature* of the word, & use of it, by all parties hitherto, being a *breach*
Mar. 2. 21. *of union*, in what kind or degree soever.

It

It was well observed by a learned man, that the reverend Doctor's notion of Schism was this: "If my coat be rent, and hang together by some threads; it is no Schism; but if a piece be quite torn off, it is none. And indeed, if Schism be onely a *difference*, in a particular Congregation, (as the reverend Doctor will have it) and no *separation* from a true Church, be justly accounted a *Schism*, (as he professes to hold) the generall *agreement* of all the forenamed parties, in the common notion of Schism; and their *concernment* init, (all of them supposing themselves, to be truly *constituted* Churches) call for an opposition to him, for denying himself and party to be *Schismaticall*, in renouncing of communion with them, and separating from them all; for they all conclude, in the antient and received notion of Schism, viz. "A breach "of union, or a causelesse separation, "from a truly stated Church. The difference between them is onely this, which of them hath the true *Church state*; which if it be determined, they all agree in the conclusion: "A breach of union "with, or a causelesse separation from "such a Church so stated, is a Schism.

The rent is made worse

Thus the *Remaniste* argued, as himself propounded their argument of Schism, *pag.* 189. thus the *Episcopall* party, thus the *Presbyterians*. But it seems, the reverend Doctor, conjectured aright, that the *opposition* was like to arise from some of the *Presbyterian* party, though he mistook the reasons; "The preju-"dices that they might (fear them-"selves, and interests) obnoxious to, "by a reception and stablishment of "that his notion of Schism; Which what they could be, I cannot conjecture. If his *notion* were true, it might be as *usefull* to them, as to himself, in freeing them also from the charge of *Schism* by others: But if it prove false, (as it seems to me, and many) it will be *prejudicious* to our common *cause*, against the other parties, to whose charge of *Schism* he did oppose it. Let him draw up his argument against them; thus I suppose it must be framed: "All "Schism (in the Scripture Ecclesiasti-"call sense) is a division in a particu-"lar Church: But we have made no "division in (or separation from) any "particular Church; (one of you plea-"ding yourselves to be the Catho-"lick, the other a Nationall Church),

Page 4.

against it. His *surmises* (which he charges me with hereafter) are as strong, as his *conjectures*; as That his *Treatise* should be refuted, he heard it was judged necessary at *sundry conventions*. And *pag.* 9. talks of my *adversaries*, and once more, of the *promoters of my work*, *page* 181. Whereof I know nothing. I can professe, that I expected and heard of, that some *more able hand* would have undertaken it; and finding none willing, I ventured my own *credit* and *thoughts*, to the vindication of the truth of our *Churches* and *Ministry*, to some good progresse, before any one man knew I had undertaken it. What *acceptance* his Treatise found, with many *learned and godly* persons, (except of his *own way*) I cannot conjecture. But this was the *reformation* of it, by all that I met with, before I ever saw his Book: That by his new notions of Schism, and constitution of a particular Church, he had not onely freed his party from the charge of Schism; but also unchurcht our Churches, and unministred our Ministers, and destroyed our Ordination. And every one wished, that some body would undertake it, as *injurious* to our Churches;

ties; but none would interest himself therein. I must confesse my own *presumption*, in what I have done, as taking the work out of some *learneder hands*, whom it more concern'd to answer it. The *originall* charge of *Schism* upon our Church, (which the reverend Doctor took upon him to answer) being directed onely to the two *Universities*, whose cause the reverend Doctor hath I think betrayed, by his new notion of Schism, as if that were the *judgment* and *answer* of them all. As some others have found out, "A new "way of justifying our separation from "*Rome*, on principles of limiting the "jurisdiction of that Bishop, to a pe-"culiar Patriarchate, and the like; as the reverend Doctor told us, of Schism. *page* 192. Which *new waies* our cause needs not, but is easily defended without them; and "our plea will not be "shaken to eternity, as the reverend Doctor asserted, *page* 192. of Schism. But he conjecturing right, (as he easily might, being told it) of the *party* in generall, and of the particular *person*, that was like, and ready to undertake him; he was as confident, "That he might "relieve himself from his fears, and "loa-

"loathing to be engaged in those con-
"troules, by these ensuing considerations
which I shall briefly consider.

Page 5. 1. "He was fully perswaded, that
"what he had written, was, for the
"substance of it, the truth of God
"which he had good security he had in
"weakenesse maintained, page 3. No
doubt, but he might fully so perswade
himself; and what Heretick, learned or
unlearned, does not so believe? But
what was my *designe*, but to undeceive
him in this perswasion, as to many
things by him asserted? 2. What was
that truth, he was so fully perswaded
of? That *Schisme* in the places of the
Corinthians, where the word is onely
found, was a *difference* or division in a
particular Church, who ever denyed it?
or what is this to the *generall nature* of
Schisme? Is that all that *Schisme* imports?
Or proves it, that breach of the union
of Churches, or *causelesse separation*
from true Churches, is no Schisme?
What force is there (I appeal to his Lo-
gick and *Divinity* too) in this conse-
"quence, "Schisme, in the places cited,
"was a division in a particular Church;
"*Ergo*, Nothing is a Schisme but that;
"in Scripture notion. Yet this *notion*,

reverend Doctor oft makes use of, to avoid the charge of *Schism*, upon himself and party, as I have elsewhere shewed.

"He had (he saies) laid in provision against all contending about words, expressions, &c. and every thing, though true, that might be separated from the life or substance, of the notion or truth pleaded for; viz. The *sentence* afore noted, concerning the *nature* of Schism. He had indeed laid in a politick *petitio principii*, that all Readers would be so favourable, as to grant him this *new notion*, or else he could expect no good issue of his Treatise; for so he professed, *pag.* 30. "Unless men will condescend so to state it upon the evidence tendred, I shall "not hope to prevail much, in the "processe of this discourse." And such I think hath been the successe, if any rationall man be taken with this inference. "This evill mentioned by "the Apostle, is Schism; therefore no-"thing else is so? Yes, (which to me is a wonder in so wise a man) the reverend Doctor is convinced by it, and resolved so to continue; for so he said, "Having before asserted this to be the "chief

Of Schism, pag. 42. "chief and onely seat of the Doctri
"of Schism, I am inclinable so to d
"and this I am resolved of, that unle
"any man can prove, that somethi
"else is termed Schism, by some divi
"Writer, &c. I will be at liberty, fro
"admitting it so to be. Somethin
was said to this in my former Trac
page 39. I add a little more; 1. His a
sertion, that this was the chief and one
ly *place* of the word Schism, in the Ec
clesiasticall sense, was granted him; bu
that it was the chief and onely place
of the *Doctrine* of *Schism*, is now deny
ed him; because the Apostle did be
indeed, reprove and check them fo
their *Schism* and divisions, but inten
ded not to speak to the *doctrine*, or ful
nature of Schism; that must be else
where enquired and found out, eithe
from the *notion* of the word σχισμα, o
other words of *equivalent* sense. 2. H
requires, that something else be *termed*
Schism, by some divine Writer; that is
he expects, that he must have the same
word, or else, though it have the same
nature, and be equally *criminous*, he
is resolved, nothing else is *Schism*, but
a *division* in a particular Church, con
trary to his own grant. *page* 21. of
schism:

ism; "That that alone shalbe esteemed Schism, which is in scripture so called; or (marke that) which hath the entire nature of that, which is there so called. But (say I) other words in other places, have the entire nature of Schism, *viz.* division in a church, & something more *ia.* separation from it; *Ergo*, that may be esteemed Schisme, as I instanced in other words and places; to which the Reverend Doctor sayes nothing.

5. "The whole weight of the little pile, turning on one single hinge and that visible and conspicuous, *&c.* he promised himselfe, that he who undertook it, would be farre from passing it by, and set himselfe to the superstructure, *&c.* This he repeats gaine *p.* 78. "That he laid the great weight of the whole, upon this notion of Schism; that in that only place of the *Corinthians*, there is mention of Schism in an Ecclesiastical sense, *&c.* To which I say, 1. If this hinge of the whole, was so visible and conspicuous, I cannot but wonder; that I alone should not see that, which to every considering person that should but view the Treatise, would

pag. 8.

"be

"be evident; And that he should so
ten charge me "with ignorance of
"designe; of which anon. 2. I wa
farre from passing it by, that I gran
them this to be the onely place; b
not the full importance and nature
the word; yea I endeavoured to she
that there was a degree of *Separation*
that place, as to some *Ministers* and
dinances; which how he hath taken aw
we shall heare anone. 3. Granting h
his sense in that place, I proved his co
sequence to be naught "The Schi
"amongst the Corinthians, was a di
"sion in a particular Church; *Fr*
"nothing else is schim, in the scrip
"sense. Which consequence, all con
dering and rationall men, that I spe
with; do wonder to fall from so gr
a Logitian and Divine. 4. This *Notio*
his, I knew well, was the *Hinge* or *C*
ne of the whole superstructure; b
the *Circumference* or lines, by way
consectaries, * extended to a grea
distance, as thus: If *Schism* be onel
Difference in a particular Church, th
his party are no *Schismaticks*; in se
rating from, 1. The Church of Rom
2. From our Nationall, 3. Or Pres
terian Churches. Now the *Antecede*

* *He sayes his first Chapter of the nature of Schism contained the foundation of many inferences Page 52.*

bei

ng by me demolished, as the hinge
ich consequences; the whole super-
ture is fallen with its owne weight;
his whole *Treatise* with it; As wiser
then my selfe do think.

"He expresly waved mens Judg-
ments, and Authority, old or late;
and so promised himself, security from
such disturbance, *&c.* To which I
swered, The *Concurring judgment* of all
en, in all ages, of all perswasions, Page. 4.
ayes weight with it, especially when
agrees with expresse Scripture; or re-
lar and rationall deduction: to which
professed to stand or fall, *Cap.* 1. 5. 3.
o which he sayes just nothing.

"Whereas he had confin'd him- Page. 6.
selfe to a bare defensative of some,
not intending to cast others from
their places, (unlesse the Roman par-
ty) he had some expectations that
peace-loving godly men, would not
be troubled, that an apparent immu-
nity from a crime, was, without their
prejudice, manifested in behalfe of
their brethren, *&c.* But he must know
that his defence of some from the crime
of *Schism*, as it was too weak to bear
it off, by the bare *Notion* of *Schism* by
him inverted; so it did cast an *aspersion*
upon

upon others of a *false accusation*, charging them with *Schisme*; and fides, in the consequences of that N tion, did cast others (beside the *Re party*) from their places, as no Churc no members of a Church, as shall peare ere long: but I appeal any of re godlinesse, and indifferent judgme to determine whether he himselfe not *blew the Coal* that gave fire to t dissension, by his new notions *Schisme*, and of a particular Church, &

6. But he addes this more to h
pag. 8. thoughts, "That he obviated the fa
"fury of rendring a discourse to t
"purpose; by its being led out of t
"common rode, wherein comm
"place-supplyes would be of little us
Truly that was likely to cause so
Opposition; that the Reverend Docto
went out of the *Common rode*, (whe
was no allowed way) by his *Singul*
notion of *Schisme*; that never was go
in by any before him, nor I think wi
be followed by any after him, (I one
except another *Notionist*, *Lud. Molin*, i
another controversie in his *Corolla*
rium, p. 100. Who in approbation o
this new notion, tells us; "The whol
"Christian world, from the Apostle
times

times, never knew of such a notion of the nature of Schism, till the Reverend Doctor taught it them. And I really believe him; onely I think he could have added, that the *Apostles* themselves never knew of such a notion. What ever was said by me "about minister's callings, Church-government, or the like, was occasioned by himself, in his *superstructures* upon that weake foundation, as shall appeare.

Whether the Reverend Doctor, hath given a *plaint and full returne* to what may seeme of importance in my Book, others must judge, and not we our selves; who do observe (all I meet with) that little or nothing is said by him, to the *Argumentative part* thereof, but some *slighter velitations*, to defend his own *new Notions*; leaving the principall parts untouched. This will appear in his *Account* of his thoughts, in the view of my Treatise; which he twice recapitulates for failing, to give notice of the particulars of it. I must take a review of them. Pag. 9.

1. He sayes, "I am without any provocation intended or given, revilled from one end of it to the other; and called partly in downe-right termes,

"termes, partly by oblique intimatio
"Sathan, Atheist, Sceptick, Donati
"Heretick, &c. I must professe, wh
I first readd this charge, I stood amaz
and astonished, that my Treatise shou
be charged with the *crime* of *revilin*
whereupon I took it up, and read
over again and again, to see, if I cou
discover so much *weaknesse* or guil
nesse in my self; and fearing my ow
partiality, I consulted with other lea
ned and godly persons, who had rea
it, who professed, they found nothin
in it, but *words of truth and sobernesse*
and such as might become a *Christia*
Adversary, as being *sharp* to the cau
he opposed, but sufficiently *respectful*
to his person, whom he did oppose
But this is not the least misery in Con
troversies, that what is intended again
the *way*, is applyed to the person, an
so provokes by accident to furthe
strife. But for those particulars, by him
called *revilings*, I give him this accoun
a. If I at any time call him personally
schismatick, which I think I do not
but onely his way and party to be schis
matical, he knowes I cannot avoid it,
if I make good the Title of my Book,
supposing him to be an Independent,

he is generally taken to be. And why may not a *good man* be a *schismatick*, as well as those *honest Corinthians*, whom both the *Apostle* and himself, charge with the *crime* of schism? If I have not proved his *way* to be a *schism*, I shall confesse my wrong, in calling of him, or him, Schismaticall. 2. For the word *Sectary*, that followes upon the former; if men by schism separate into *fractions* or *sections*, they will deserve the name of Sectaries; and himself calls some men so. 3. For *Heretick*, as it was more than I charged him or his way with, (speaking strictly of *Independents*) so I never call them so; though I believe himself does not deny, but some Independent Churches are *Heteticall*. 4. For *Donatists*, I onely charged their *principles* upon his way, which if they be acknowledged to be *schismaticall*, (as they are, by all that are Orthodox, and by himself confessed to be *criminall* at least) the *parallel* will fall upon them, whether I will or no; as it doth upon the *Romanists*, embracing and maintaining the same *principles*. 5. For the word *Pharisee*, when he spake, as I thought, too *contemptibly* of Christians, the *multitude*, the *wicked*,

and *profane*, I onely said, "*This sound*
"*too much of the Pharisee.* But it
known, they *separate* from the best o
our Congregations, as well as from
such, My answer here, was just the same
that the *learned Doctor Hall* gave to th
Apol. f. 28. *Brownists*, for like *aspersions* upon ou
Congregations. 6. As for those words
Atheist or *Sceptick*, the first is but once
used, *page* 15. in these words: "*He*
"*that denyes, that professed Christian*
"*may be compelled to the externall pro-*
"*fession of the onely way of worship, seems*
"*to me to be, if not an Atheist, a Sceptick*
"*in Religion.* What's this to the reve-
rend Doctor, or any man living, that
does not deny that my assertion? The
word *Sceptick* is once more used, upon
the like supposition, *page* 187. 7. Last-
ly, the worst is, that I call him *Sathan*;
which I no where do, in downright
tearms, nor necessarily, in an oblick in-
timation or reflection: For 1. A man
that saies to a *blasphemer*, or other no-
torious *slanderer* or curser, *The Lord*
rebuke thee, (which were the words he
excepts against, & yet these not directly
spoken neither) does not presently call
him Devill or Sathan. 2. The cause of
using those words, was very urgent and

provoking, as I thought, in his charging our *Ordination* to come from *Antichrist the Beast*; which was in effect to deny or annull our Ministry and Churches: As our blessed *Saviour* did obliquely, yea directly, call a man as good as himself, *Sathan*, when he would have hindred him from suffering: "*Get thee behind me, Sathan, for thou savourest not "the things that be of God, &c.* 3. And what is that lesse, (if not more direct) then calling me Sathan, *page* 22? when speaking of me, as *carried beyond all bounds of moderation, and Christian tenderness in offending*; he adds, "*I no "way doubt, but that Sathan hath his "designe in this whole businesse. Jam sumus ergo pares.* If this be *reviling*, from one end of the book to another, let the indifferent Reader judge. Yea, some do say, (and I could observe it) that the reverend Doctor, though he have given me very *sweet words* and *complementall*; yet hath secretly more *reviled* me, and endeavoured to *blast* my *reputation* with godly men, than I have him. I may note it in some passages hereafter.

In this one p. 11. discovering sanguinary thoughts against them pag. 11.

2. The next is no lesse bitter; "*The "professed designe of the whole, is to prove "Independency to be a great schism, and*

"*that Independents are schismaticall se-*
"*ctaries, the troublers of* England. *That*
"*it were happy for the Nation, they were*
"*out of it. Or discovering sanguinary*
"*thoughts, in reference to them. And*
"*these kind of discourses fill up the book*
"*almost from one end to the other.* I have
much ado to forbear to say once more,
The Lord rebuke thee, in the sense afore-
said. 1. For the first part, that my de-
signe was, to prove *Independency* to be
a great *schism*, and consequently Inde-
pendents (whom I mean, we shall hear
anon) to be *schismaticall*, I cannot de-
ny, if I intended to make good the *title*
of my Book; and such kind of discourse
must necessarily fill up my Book, from
one end to another. But I pray, am
the first, that hath charged them and
their *way* to be *schismaticall*? have not
many learned and pious men done it
before me? and is this the first time that
I have *so charged* it, that it seems so
novell to the reverend Doctor? And if
they have, some of them, been proved
such, and *sectaries* besides, do not such
trouble the peace of the Church? Of
some, I doubt not, he will confesse it;
and, with me, wish them any where
rather then in *England*, and think the
Nation

Nation happy in their avoidance. *Paul* said of such, "*I would they were cut off* "*that trouble you.* 2. But for the latter part, "*My discovering sanguinary* "*thoughts, in reference to them.* I should hate my self, if I were *guilty* of it, and shall appeal all Readers, when they hear my words, whether they import so much; *page* 200. "*These new builders* "*will gather a Church out of no Chur-* "*ches, and begin a new one: It had been* "*happy for Old* England, *if they had all* "*gone into New* England, *and laid the* "*foundation of their Churches amongst* "*the Indians, and not to build upon other* "*mens foundations; and then tell us, They* "*are building spick and span new Chur-* "*ches.* This was the worst I said, and but once onely; as far from *sanguinary*, as from *filling up* my Book, from one end to the other.

Men whose tender mercies are cruel. p. 18.

3. But he goes on; "*No Christian* "*care seems to have been taken, nor good* "*conscience exercised, from the beginning* "*to the ending, as to imputation of any* "*thing unto me, or upon me, that may* "*serve to help the designe in hand.* The designe he told us, was, to prove *Independency* to be a *great schism*; and, I must confesse, my care was, to make

pag. 11.

that way to appeare as *Deformed* as I could, with *reason* and *truth*; but as for his *person*, being to me as very a ſtranger as I to him; I was ſo farre from wronging him, by falſe or ſtrained *imputations*, that I gave him his *due commendations*, where I could; as appeares by my *p.* 36. and *p.* 102. both in *approving*, and *applauding* his diſcourſe; and from one end of my book, to another, giving him his *due titles* and reſpect. But let him inſtance, in thoſe conſcience-leſſe imputations upon him. "*Hence* (*he ſayes*) "*I think it is repeated an hundred times,* p. 12. "*that I deny their Miniſters, Churches,* "*and all Reformed, but our owne*; *which* "*is notoriouſly untrue, contrary to my* "*knowne judgment, to expreſſe affirmati-* "*ons in my book*, &c. But 1. the Reverend Doctor ſpeaks *Hyperbolically* enough, when he ſayes it is repeated, *an hundred times*, that he denyes our *Miniſters*, &c. He may do well to number them, and ſee how farre ſhort the reckoning comes. 2. I confeſſe, I took it for granted; that the Reverend Doctor was a *thorough Independent*, in the *voice* of all men; and I knew that *Independents* do deny our *Miniſters* and *Churches*, &c. If the judgment of the reverend Doctor be

be now altered, I shall rejoyce much, in the *successe* of any Treatise, mine or others, to his conversion, 3. But if he yet be constant to his *Principles* delivered in his former *Treatise*, and *vox populi* be not a *very lyar*; I shall not doubt if need be, to say a thousand times, he does at least by consequence deny our *Ministry*, and *Churches*; our *Ordination* and all, even our *Church-membership*. But of that more fully anone.

I cannot here but observe one piece of *policy*, the Reverend Doctor hath made use of (observed also by others) beyond his *Predecessours*, in this controversie, to *ingratiate* himselfe, and way, with vulgar readers, to make them seem the better. 1. That he is so free and frequent in *Commending* of me, his adversary. *p.* 10 and 46. 121. and elsewhere; as *Hierome* said of *Ruffinus*, "*He wrongs me with praises*; Surely (they will think) he will never wrong the *truth*, that does right to his *Adversary*, 2. His extraordinary *Complements*, after the *Mode* of the times; may pretend to great *Humility*, considering the distance betwixt him and me, a *Reverend Doctor and Deane*, and a poore country *Presbyter*; such as these, "*Let him at any time*

"*give me a command to wait upon him,*
"19. *I desire to know, when and wh*
"*I may personally wait upon him,* p. 39.
"*humbly begg of this Author, that h*
"*would favour me with a command,* &c
"p. 85. See also. p. 92. 129. 139. 18
All most *as oft repeated*, as those charge
upon me afore; all which some woul
interprete for so many *yeares*, but I d
not so, 3. He hath yet another *policy*
taking it *pro confesso*, that I am guilty
and that he would have his *Reader* think
so too; that is, his *frequent prayers, fo*
forgiveneſſe of my miscarriages, and h
owne forgiveneſſe; which is repeated in
my observation, 5. Times, *p.* 14. 51.
124. 149. 180. As if he would by such
Charity, perswade me also, as well as
his reader, that I had greatly wronged
him. And yet it seems that though his
charity can *forgive* his wrongs, yet it
cannot *forget* them; for it is repeated
often, (30 times at least) that I *wrong*
him notoriously; and frequent *charges* of
me, with *untruth*, *wrongs*, *lyes*, *&c.* to
make me *odious* to his Reader: yea there
is more *bitterneſs* couched in one sen-
tence, after he had newly prayed for
me, than is to be found in all my books;
p. 14. this it is "*Untill I saw this Treatise, I did*

"*not*

not believe that there had remained in any one godly, sober, judicious person in England, such thoughts of heart; in reference to our present differences, as are visible and legible therein and tells me boldly, "*I have taken paines to cast "oyle on those flames, which it is every ones "duty to labour to extinguish.* Whereas I did but cast *water*, as I thought, upon those *flames* which he had *unhappily* kindled, by his new Notions.

But we have a second *Review* of my Treatise, wherein my *Mistakes* are presented to the Reader, with respect to that *influence* they have into the argumentative part of my discourse; *viz.* my *ungrounded suppositions*, as he calls them.

1. "*It is* (sayes he) *strenuously supposed* pag. 16.
"*all along, that I deny all Churches in*
"*England to be true churches of Christ*
"*except onely the Churches gathered in*
"*the congregationall way*, That I may
"distinctly answer this; let it be considered, that (as I said before) I supposed the Reverend Doctor, to be an Independent, upon the generall vote of all men, and I knew it to be the judgment of many; and the * consequent of their declared principle, that no Churches

* That this is the consequence of their tes-

plicite Covenant, see what is the judgment of the Walachrian *Churches*: Hæc sententia privat omnes Ecclesias reformatas, quæ tali fœdere non uniuntur, vero Ecclesiastico ministerio, potestate Vocandi & Ordinandi ministros, legitima sacramentorum administratione, Ecclesiastica jurisdictione, &c. Et negat omnes in Ecclesiis illis baptizatos, ritè & verè baptizatos esse, &c. *Apollon. Consid. quarundam Controv. &c. pag.* 23.

Churches are truly constituted, but such as are gathered in the Congregationall way. 2. I took the word *Independent* generally, as comprehending *Brownists*, *Anabaptists*, and other *Sectaries*, who strenuously affect

that we are no *true Churches*. 3. Though I sometimes speak, as of the reverend Doctor his person, (especially, when his notion is new and singular, as in that of *schism*, &c.) yet I intended indefinitely, any kind of Independents, and not him distinguished from the rest. They commonly deny our Churches. In a word, I respected his *way*, rather then his *person*; all along my Treatise. What then? does the reverend Doctor in his judgment, without *equivocation* hold our Churches to be true Churches? We are glad of his *concessions*, but fear, that he will be *lost* with many *Independent* Churches, who hold us *Antichristian*; and believe, that his own *principles* will confute his present concessions

sions. But hear what he saies, "*I now inform him, that all those surmises are* [illegible] *and untrue*, pag. 17. And tells us, *He shall as willingly engage in the defence of the Ministry, of the godly Ministers in* England, *with the lawfulness of their Churches, as any what ever.* p. 20. Though the words be ambiguously spoken, I must take heed of *opinion* or *suspition* of *insincerity*, in his profession, lest he charge me with new *surmises*: What then doth he scruple at? "*I onely in my Treatise have questioned, the institution of a Nationall Church.* A *Nationall Church* hath (as we was told) a double notion; it imports either an *Hierarchicall Church*, with subordination of Officers, (which he saies, I do not maintain) or a *Church*, where all the Churches of a Nation agree in Doctrine and Worship, and celebrate it accordingly, in the *Presbyterian* way. Which of these does he question? or rather, which of them does he allow to be true Churches? Does he not renounce and dispute against both, as Churches not truly constituted, and so, in the judgment of *Independents*, *Brownists*, *Anabaptists*, no true Churches, yea, *Antichristian*? Do not his

own

own *principles* infer this conclusio
"*If any man hath nothing to shew, bu*
"*successive Ordination, through, or fr*
"Rome, *he looks not on him, as a Mi*
"*ster of Christ.* But all our *Mini*
have nothing else to shew, (as valid)
make them *Ministers*, but their *succ*
sive Ordination; *Ergo*, He looks up
them as no *Ministers* of Christ,
consequently, we have no Church
Will he engage in defence of such
Ministry, such *Churches*? But more
this again, ere long. And now I am n
indebted to give him any satisfaction
pag. 21. (having done him no injury) he hade
posed himself to the *censure* and *disp*
sure of many godly *Ministers*, *Church*
and *Christians*, before ever I saw
Book. And I go on to the next.

2. A second supposition (he sayes)
"*That what ever the presbyterian Mi*
"*sters and Churches be, he hath sepa*
"*ted from them, as have done all thos*
"*whom he calls Independents.* What say
the Reverend Doctor to this; "*Doth*
"*this reverend Author know, that this*
"*denyed by us? Is it not sufficiently disp*
"*ved, in that very Treatise which he u*
"*dertakes to answer?* However, the re
verend Doctor himself, might not
tall

separate from us, holding *compli-*
in preaching or hearing, in our
urches, to what *ends*, he knowes.
surely, those Independents whom
names, *Brownists*, *Anabaptists*, &c.
utterly refuse *communion* with us,
Antichristian, as no *Churches*, no *Mi-*
sters: Yea, many of those who are
gle, or *singular Independents*, not yet
ne so far as *Brownists* or *Anabaptists*,
not so much as *hear* (much lesse re-
ive the Sacrament) in our Churches,
nlesse some of theirs *preach*. And may
ey not justifie it upon his own *prin-*
ples? Does he not confidently deny,
y *separation* from a Church to be
hism? And in this place, does he not
osely justifie their separation; "*The*
blameable separation must respect some
union of Christs institution. Now where-
in have we (*we*, not *I*) *separated from*
them, as to the breach of any such union?
pray now, what's this, in true sense,
ut, we have indeed *separated* from you,
ut without *breach of any union* of
Christs institution, for you were not
Churches united, according to his in-
stitution. Just as he pleaded for *separa-*
tion from *Rome*, and from the *Nationall*
Church. And what followes hence, but

pag. 22.

this,

this, We are no *true Churches*; and their *separation* is just. Thus he pleads for all, *Independents, Brownists, Anabaptists*; for the *plea* is theirs, to justifie their separation. Some of them can come and hear in our Churches, but upon *Robinsons* latter principles, not as *Churches*, or *Ministers*, but as *gifted brethren*. But hear him plead for himself: "For "my part, what hath he to lay to my charge? "I condemn not their Churches in general, "to be no Churches. Nor do the *Brownists* so, some true *Churches* they do allow us, of the *Independent* dresse; at least, *comparatively*, they say, we are not so bad as the *Whore of Babylon*. But he goes on: "I never disturbed, that I know "of, the peace of any one of them, since "separated from them. What? was he never of any particular *Church*, as a *member*, as a *Minister*? not of that in *Essex*? did he never separate from them? not disturb the *peace* of that, or some Churches, by raising *divisions* in them, *soliciting* proselytes out of them? Hath he not by his book of *Schism*, cast fire into all the Churches of *England*? Did he not labour to *gather a Church*, in his own *College*, if report fail not? In his former book, and present defence, doth he

See Dr. Hall *Apol.* p. 52. Mcd.

not *advise* others, to *come out* of our urches? Of schism, *page* 270. If all s be true, his *crime* preceded his *pu-ment*, and he may be content to *bear* whilst I go on to the next.

3. "*He supposeth throughout, that I deny, not onely the necessity of a successive Ordination; but, the lawfulnesse of it also.* No, I supposed (and proved) t he denies the lawfulnesse of *our cessive Ordination*; by which I under-od, not onely *imposition* of hands, the whole *authoritative translation* of nan, into the state of an Officer of the urch. Now, does not the reverend ctor deny our *Ordination* as fully, as *ownists* or *Anabaptists*, upon the same ound, because we had it *successively* m *Rome*? I repeat his words again; *If any man have nothing to plead for his Ministry, but meerly that successive Ordination, received through the Church of* Rome, *I cannot see a stable bottom, of owning him so to be.* If this be t to deny our *Ordination* and *Ministry* o, let the Reader judge. If he thinks sufficient to say, he doth not deny r Ordination, because he is pleased to atisfie us with another plea, *page* 197. f schism; "*that he disclaims all thoughts* "*of*

Of schism. p. 196.

"*of rejecting those Ministers, as Pa*
"*and Antichristian, who yet adhere*
"*that Ordination, being many of th*
"*eminently gifted of God, &c. and s*
"*mitted to by the people, &c.* This is
far from justifying our Ordination,
our being Ministers by vertue there
that it doth the clean contrary: It te
us onely, That though indeed our O
dination do not make us *Ministers*,
we are not by our Ordination so *in*
pacitated, but that, notwithstanding
we may by somewhat else be made *M*
nisters; *viz.* our *gifts*, and the peop
submission. And if (when he saies,
does not renounce his *own Ordinati*
his meaning be this, that he doth
deny, but that he was ordained, and
holds, that notwithstanding his Ordi
tion, he may (upon some other
count) be a Minister, we wish he wo
have spoken out, and let others jud
whether this be a renouncing of
Ordination or not.

pag. 34. But the reverend Doctor seems to
turn'd *Orthodox*, in point of Ordina
on; "*I say, it is according to the m*
"*of Christ, that he who is to be ordai*
"*unto office in any Church, receive im*
"*sition of hands from the Elders of t*
"*Chur*

Church, *if there be any there*; *and this to be done in a way of succession*, *that the Churches may be perpetuated*. Mark, *imposition* of hands from the *Elders* of that Church, not by a *Presbytery* forreigne to that Church; *If there be any there*. But if none there, he tells us not, what is to be done then. Besides, he speaks onely of *imposition* of hands, (which he blamed others for) as if that were all of Ordination, when as he told us, "*The Scripture compriseth in it, the whole authoritative translation of a man into an Officer, differing from the other as whole and part*. And that *succession* he speaks of, ceases, when there are no *Officers* in that Church, or a *new Church* is to be erected; then it must fall upon the people, or I know not whom. But how comes this *change*, and how long? Was it not the reverend Doctor, that when some young men came to advise with him, about their Ordination, dissuaded them from it? Was it not he that said, that he would maintain against all the *Ministers* of *England*, there was in Scripture no such thing as *Ordination*? Was it not he, that when it was objected to him, desiring to be a Parliament-Man, that he was *incapable* of it,

as being a Minister, would not answer, He was, or was not a *Minister*? this was *vox populi*, at *Oxford*. And was not this to renounce his Ordination? What then is it that he doth oppose? "*The denying* (I "suppose it should be the deriving) "*this successive Ordination, through the* "*authority of Antichrist.* This fallacy does not become the reverend Doctor's learning, it is *fallacia compositionis*. We derive our *Ordination*, not from *Antichrist*, but from such as were truely *presbyters, successively ordained*, though with some corruptions: This he was told again and again, was the answer of all our best Divines, but he takes no notice of it: Yea, *Luther*, and our first *Reformers*, had no other Ordination but such; will he look on them as no *Ministers* of Christ? Hear what he saies

pag. 24. "*Before the blessed Reformation begun* "*and carried on by* Zuinglius, Luther, "&c. *there were, and had been, two* "*states of men in the world, professing the* "*name of Christ and the Gospell, as to the* "*outward profession thereof; the one in* "*glory, &c. the other poor, &c.* Consider now, whether the reverend Doctor do not acknowledge the *Church of Rome* to be a Church, *professing* the name of

Christ

Christ and the *Gospell*, as to the outward *profession* of it? which lately he did deny, and will again ere long, *page* 26. And I ask, of what Church *Luther* and *Zuinglius* were, before the Reformation? either of *Rome* or none; a *corrupt Church*, but yet a Church. But he adds; "*As to the claim of a successive Ordination, down from the Apostles, I made bold to affirm, I could not understand the validity of it, as successive, which was derived to us, from, and by, the first party of men in the world.*" pag. 25. I hope, if any Church can prove a *successive Ordination* from the *Apostles*, it would be no *prejudice*, but an *honour* to it; as the *Greek* Church, I suppose, does plead, and not from *Rome*. And if it was our unhappiness, to have our successive Ordination through *fouler hands*, (if at least fouler then some of the *Greek* Churches) yet truely *Ministers*, shall that invalidate our *Ordination*? Must we be charged, to derive our Ordination from *Antichrist*, as *Antichrist*, or from the *Beast*, as the *Beast*, because we had it from some that were members, or officers of that (newly confessed) Church? That was it that warmed my * zeal so much, as to tell the reverend Doctor, that

* *So he excused Austin against the Donatists, p. 166 of schism. pag. 25.*

that he cast *dirt* in the face of our Ministry, and to be ready to say, *The Lord rebuke thee.* Dare he appeal the *Searcher* of all hearts, he had no designe in all this, to cast dirt on any godly *Ministers* in *England*, when as this is the *filth* that is daily cast upon us, by his friends, the *Brownists*, *Anabaptists*, and some *Independents*, not yet gone so far as others, Our *Antichristian Ministry*? He call'd for satisfaction, for supposed wrongs; but what *satisfaction* will he give, to all the *Ministers* of *England*, and other *Nations*, for thus *reviling* of them, to say, "*They derived their successive Ordination,* "*through the authority of Antichrist.* But (saies the reverend Doctor) "*Might not another answer have been re-* "*turned, without that wrath? This is so,* "*or it is not so, in reference to this Nation:* "*If it be not so, and they plead not* "*their successive Ordination from* Rome, "*there is an end of this difference.* This is a *pleasing notion* to the reverend Doctor, for he uses it twice more, once *page* 28. and again, *page* 130. But 1. Might not the reverend Doctor have given a better *resolution* of the case, as all our *Divines* hitherto have done? Our *successive Ordination* is not claimed from *Rome* as

Bartlet, *in his Model.*

page 26.

D. Hal *Apol. against Brownists, sect.* 30. *p.* 108.

Papal

Papall or *Antichristian*, but from *Rome*, so far as *Christian*, the *Papacy* being but the *Leprosie* of that Church. Must he needs take the *worser part* of the distinction, and cast *dirt* on our Ministry, before *Papists*, and all our *Sectarian* enemies? And was not that my answer, to which he saith nothing, but still goes on to provoke by *scornfull* language. His *Dilemma*, with its horns, intends to gore us on both sides; "*If it be not so*, "*there's an end of this difference, we are* "*wholly agreed; and what need those ex-* "*clamations?* *pag.* 28. That is, if we do not plead our *Ordination* from *Rome*, (and have no other to plead) we have *none at all*, and so no *Ministers*, no *Churches*, that way. If it be so, that we say, we have our *Ordination* from *Rome*, then he concludes us *Antichristian*, You have your *Ordination* through the *authority* of *Antichrist*. To prevent both these, I distinguished as afore: We have it not from *Rome* as *Antichristian*, but from *Officers* of that Church, though much corrupt. Are we now at all agreed, when he derives our *pedigree* from *Antichrist* and the *Beast*, and I derive it from *Officers* of that Church, which he rejects? Calls he this an Agreement? I say it is

from *Rome*, and he sayes so too, and so the vulgar must believe, we are agreed. *Dolosus versatur in universalibus* and hates Distinctions as evill doers do the light.

But I asked, why may not this be a sufficient foundation of our *Ministry* as well as for our *Baptisme*? He asks me (as afore) "*If it be so, and be so acknowledged, whence is that provocation that arose from my Enquiry after it*; which may receive the same answer as afore: The provocation arose from charging us to receive both, from the *Authority* of *Antichrist*. And I asked him Whence he derived his owne *Baptisme*? To which he gives no satisfactory answer, but now tells me (very strangely) "*I judge their Baptisme good and valid*; "*but to deal plainly with him, not on that* "*foundation*. Upon what then? Might not the men that received their *Baptisme* and power to *Baptize* from that *successive ordination*, receive also power to *ordaine*? or does he so far joyn with the *Anabaptists*, that *any disciple*, no-Minister, may baptize; or does he renounce his *successive baptisme*, as some (if not himselfe) have done their *Ordination* from *Rome*? Heare his answer; "*I cannot be-*

"*lieve*,

"lieve, that that *Idolater, murtherer, man*
"*of sinne*, had, *since the dayes of his open*
"*Idolatry persecution and enmity to*
"*Christ, any authority more or lesse com-*
"*mitted to him from the Lord, n or over his*
"*Churches*. Change the *Scene*, and let him tell us; what he believes concerning *Christian Idolatrous* persecuting *Magistrates*; Do they thereupon *forfeit* their *Authority* over their people and *Churches*? *Parcius ista*: If he say, its otherwise with *Ministers*, I put him the case of the *Idolatrous* persecuting high *Priests* among the Jewes; Were they presently *Exauthorized* upon those miscariages? nay, must not *Antichrist sit in the Temple of God*, 2 *Thes.* 2. 4. that is, the Church; "*professing the name of*
"*Christ, and the Gospell, as to the outward*
"*profession thereof*; as he told us, *p.* 24. The Reverend Doctor hath endeavoured to elude that text, (of Schism *p.* 154.), by a glosse or interpretation of St. *Austins* de. civ Dei. *l.* 10. *c.* 59. That the words are thus to be rendered; "*A*
"*rising up against the Temple of God*, not a sitting in the Temple of God; and could be content it should so be taken for a present shift, which is by *Papists* themselves rejected, as most improbable, who

Estius, in loco.

who grant it meant of the *Church*; that *Antichrist* must sit in the Church, and by most, if not all our Divines, so understood in the controversie of *Anti-Christ*, "*He must not be looked for, without the Church, but* within *the bosome* "*of the Church*; *Beza in locum*. Yea if the Reverend Doctor had consulted the text; he had found *Austins* glosse the more improbable if not impossible; for the words are thus in the Greek, ὥστε αὐτὸν εἰς τὸν ναὸν τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς θεὸν καθίσαι, would this be a genuine sense; "*So that* "*he as God, sets up himselfe against the* "*Temple of God*? Besides that this would be a kind of Tautology, having before called him ὁ ἀντικείμενος, καὶ ὑπεραιρόμενος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον θεον &c. And did he not tell us, that such Churches as ours, may for ought he knowes, be in *Italy*. p. 49? Lastly, Said he not also, "*Grant the usually received sense, it im-* "*ports no more, but that the man of sinne,* "*shall set up his power against God, in the* "*midst of them, who by their outward* "*visible profession, have right to be called* "*his Temple*, that is, the Church: for are not they that make an outward visible profession of Christ and the Gospell; rightly called a Church though corrupt

and

d wicked. Did not Satan dwell and
d his throne in a Church, *Rev.* 2. 13.
at of *Pergamus*? But enough of that.
ut I said, he and his party would not
re been pleased with *Ordination* from
Presbytrie, though not from *Rome*:
e askes me angerly; "*I pray, who told*
you so? when, wherein, and by what
meanes have I opposed it? I acknowledge
my selfe of no party. I have told him
fore, when and wherein and by what
neanes he hath opposed it; if he please
o look back. I onely add, he opposed it,
y assigning *Imposition* of hands onely to
he *Elders* of a particular Church; and
y offering to *gather* an *Independent*
Church, as I have been credibly inform-
d. What need his charge of "*Transpor-*
"*tation and reflections upon him, and*
"*that without due observation of truth*
"*and love.* But, its worse, that he charges
me with an untruth, "*As if I acknow-*
"*ledged those first Reformers had their*
"*ordination from the people*; when as I
speak the direct contrary. The first *Re-*
formers, Luther *&c.* had not their ordi-
nation from the *people*, but from *Rome*,
p. 116. *et alibi.* I onely excepted
some *Extraordinary* ease, where no
Ministers were to be had for *Ordination*,

pag. 17.

and

and that onely for the first turne.

But he is as much displeased for me affirming, that he hath *renounced his* owne Ordination. He askes "*Who told* "*him these things? I am now necessitated* "*to tell him, that all these things are false* "*and utterly in part and in whole untrue* "*and he is not able to prove one of them.*

pag. 29.

My reasons, or rather *Evidences* of this charge of *renouncing his ordination* were these, 1. The world looks at him, as an *Independent* of the highest note; and I knew it is their judgment, that our *ordination* is *Antichristian*; and if so, its time for him to *renounce* it. 2. I know, from good hand, that some of the *Brethren* have renounced their *ordination*; so I am told, "*They all renounced their ordina-* "*tion in England, and ordained one an-* "*other in Holland; when* Mr. *Ward was* "*chosen pastor, and* Mr. *Bridges Teacher* "*at Roterdam, first* Mr. *Bridges or-* "*dained* Mr. *Ward, and then immedi-* "*ately* Mr. *Ward againe ordained* Mr. "*Bridges.* Thus *one hand washes another*, and I might reasonably think; the Reverend Doctor had also renounced his. 3. I had divers times heard, that he *declaimed* against and dissuaded our *ordination*; and I thought it not probable

Anat. of Independ. pag. 23.

he

would still *retein* it. 4. I concluded
m his owne *principles* in his book of
hism, that our successive ordination
me from *Antichrist* and the *Beast* as
re; and that those "*That insist upon*
hat plea, would (if he mistake not) keep
p in this particular what God would have
pulled downe, p. 198. of Schism. And
ould he keep it up in himselse? If I
re so perswaded; I should *renounce*
y *Ordination* to night, before to mor-
w. 5. If this be not sufficient, let him re-
ember what he said in the presence of
l or most of his owne *Canons*, at a pub-
ck meeting, speaking of his *Ordination*
y the Bishop of *Oxford*, in that place;
That he valued it no more, then that crum
upon his trencher or neere it, which he
sillipped away. It may be, his *Canons* will
ot affirm this to me (though to some
thers they have,) but I shall put it up-
n this *Issue*; that if they will give it un-
der their hands, that they never heard
him say those or such like words, I shall
believe the report was false. 6. I would
appeal his owne conscience, Does he
believe his former *Ordination* valid? Does
he do any *Ministeriall act* now, by vertue
of his former *ordination*? if not, what's that
but a *renouncing* of his *ordination*? If he do,
he

he contradicts or condemnes himself, *reserving* an Ordination, which he counts *Antichristian.* And then, what meanes those outcryes, "*I was never* "*yet so dealt withall, by any man* pag. 29. "*what party soever*: Does this dealing "*come a Minister of the gospells* &c. Is whether those *Recharges* upon me, 30. be not utterly *untrue*, and unbecoming his *Reverence* and *piety*, I leave to all indifferent Readers to judge, by what hath been the *Language* and *carriage* of my former discourse; and what hath here been returned. This Chapter being a *Recapitulation* of my whole book from one end to another, hath held me very long. I shall promise to be shorter in those that follow.

CHAP. II.

In answer to my Appendix.

THis Chapter is a meere ὕστερον πρότερον, if not in that the first is last, yet in that the last is first. The Reverend Doctor indeed promised us, "A "*speedy account of the Closure of my book*" p. 11. and in the *Close* of his former

Chapter,

pter: but I must confesse, I did not expect it; nor will I conjecture at preproperous vindication of his uration, as he calls it. Had not his er book of *Schism* recanted, if I may say, *contradicted* his former judgent, I had not medled with it; I can cerely professe, my intention was to *blast* his *reputation*, or to cause *Person* to suffer (to whom I was and a very stranger, not having, above ce, so much as seen his face) but to event the *prevalency* of his way, by e *Authority* of his person; to the drawg off of some well meaning people, Rom.16.8. o are easily deceived by *fair words*, d personall respects; this I thought ight the better be done, by presenting them the errors and *Inconstancy* of e men, that endeavour their seducent. The *Apostle Jude* describes Seduers, by such a Character; they are anaring Stars, as in places, so in judgent *Inconsistent* with themselves, and eir owne opinions. But if he marke , I did first in my precedent Chapters; ndeavour (with little *successe*, I conesse) to shew those persons, the *errours* f that way, before I discovered the *inonstancy* of the person; and *Inconsistency*

of

of his former and present thoughts: A
fure we may have reason to susp
their judgment, who are so *change*
in their opinions; having instances
nough of men, that have *run* from
sect to another, till they have lost the
selves, and all *Religion*. But to ret
to the businesse in hand, the revere
Doctor, after the proposition of ot
waies of *excusing* himself, for his *inc*
stancy, at length confesses the *fact*, w
the *ground* and *means* of that alterat
of his judgment.

1. The ground was this, the *suitab*
nesse of his former principles to the
pag. 34. *dependent* way; for so he saies: "*Up*
"*review of what I had then asserted*, (
"his former Treatise) *I found*, *that*
"*principles were far more suited*, *to w*
"*is the judgment and practise of the C*
"*gregationall men*, *than those of the Pr*
"*byterians*. This was the *ground* of
change, that I conjectured at, when
said, "*Perhaps these princ. ples of his*, *th*
"*laid*, *might mislead others and himself*
"*&c. pag.* 237. Those principles wer
that *gifts* and *submission* of the people
were sufficient in *some cases*, to make
Preacher of the Gospell; not having d
stinguished between a *Preacher* in a l

, and in a ſtricter ſenſe, that is, be-
een an *Inſtructer* (common to men
l women,) and a preacher in *Office*
uliar to ſome. For neglect of which
inction, how eaſie was it for men
ppoſing the *caſe* to be now *extraor-*
ary, and an *interciſion* of all ordinan-
) finding themſelves (as they eaſily
ieve) ſufficiently *gifted*. and a *giddy*
ple, thirſting after novelties, willing
be taught by ſuch *teachers*, to take
on them the *Office* of Preachers?
his is ſo viſibly the *Doctrine* and *Prac-*
e of all the Sects, that he that runns
y read it. But the *Reverend Doctor*
d there laid down other *Preſbyterian*
inciples, which are irreconcilable
th his new *congregationall* way; as ſhal
ppear.

2. The *meanes* of his converſion was
is: Undertaking to read the Books
itten on both ſides (the congre-
tionall and the Presbyterian way)
e fixed on one "*to take under peculiar*
examination; which ſeemed moſt me-
thodicall, and ſtrongly to maintain that pag. 3
which was contrary to his preſent per-
ſuaſion: that was Mr. Cotrons *Book of*
the Keyes; intending the confutation of
it. But contrary to his many Intereſts,

he

"*he was prevailed on, to receive that*
"*those principles, which he thought to*
"*himself in an opposition unto.* And th
commonly it fares with those that u
dertake *controversies*, being before p
judiced with the *principles* of that wi
as the *Reverend Doctor* professes he w
"*But had he observed his own rule*
examining impartially all things by
"*Word, comparing causes with cause*
"&c. *laying aside all prejudicate respe*
"*unto persons or present traditions,* a
considered the books written again
that very *Treatise*, and no more ;
might perhaps have been confirmed
his *Presbyterian* way, as many learn
and pious men have been. Where
now there is little hope of recoveri
him back to his first Principles, for
tells me "*That being by that means s*
pag. 37. "*led in the Truth, he is ready to main*
"*it to me and others, and finds caus*
"*rejoyce in it, in the day of the Lord Jesu*
I shall only request him, that he wou
impartially consider, what hath be
written against the *Treatise* of his Co
version, before he enter into ne
contests with me or others, or publis
that *tract* of the Authors, which h
threaten'd me with, in his *Epistle*: which
be

do, there is some hope he may re-
rn to his former *Presbyterian* princi-
es, as others have done, without any
eat *prejudice* to his reputation; he
professing himself to be of neither, of
party, p. 27.

Before I consider his answer to my
ppendix, I shall desire leave to pre-
ise, that my scope was not "*to help on*
with the proof, that Independency is a
great Schism, as he pretends p. 32. Nor
t to *cause his person* to suffer, as I said
ore; nor yet to *confute* that treatise
so, (though by the by, I might disco-
r some weaknesses in it): but "*to prove*
from it, his inconstancy and inconsisten-
cie with himselfe, who yet undertakes
convert others to, or *settle* them in, the
dependent way: And I most of all
onder, that he should so confidently
ny his change from what he then de-
ered, and say "*I am punctually of the*
same judgement still, when as he cleerly page. 40.
ofesses his change in one particular,
14. and that a *materiall* one; And for
e rest, there needs nothing to con-
nce him of a great change, but onely
Scheme of his differences in judgment
ow, from what he asserted then; which
shall exhibite to him, at the end of
is Chapter.

But before I do that, I shall onely, h
way of short *strictures*, animadvert fo
few things. 1. That his judgment w
altered, I proved thus: 1. He had, as
thought, upon the reasons afore give
renounced his ordination; at which "
"*professes himselfe astonished to thi*
"*with what frame of Spirit, what negl*
"*of all truth and love, this businesse*
"*mannaged*. And I must re-professe, th
I am astonished to think with wh
face or *spirit* of truth, he dare deny
if all be true that is reported. I co
fesse, as he carries it, I cannot tell, wh
ther ever he was *ordained* or no, by
or *Presbytery*, (for he discovers it no
and then indeed, he cannot *renounce* wh
he never had; as he sometimes argued
his former treatise of Schism: If he w
not all ordained, and yet do Ministeri
acts, his *tract*, I now consider, will co
demne him: If he was, I think he ha
done and said enough to argue his r
nuntiation of it. 2. My second proofe
so by him contrived, that I think he w
in a *maze*, when he writ it down; "*b*
"*cause he thinks now, not only in a co*
"*plent Church-state, but when no su*
"*thing can be charged, that gifts & cons*
"*of the people, is enough to make a ma*

Pre

preacher in office; both untrue and false
in fact. Untrue indeed and false, in
both and fact: for my words were
these; "He requires now no more but page. 222.
gifts and consent, and that not only in a
collapsed and corrupted Church, &c.
but now, when neither negligence nor
ignorance, can, without injury, be charged
upon our Church-state; The difference
visible to every seeing eye, without
any exagitation. And the thing is true
in word and fact; as shall appeare. To
my third observation, he sayes nothing;
Whether such a man, as he speaks of, so
qualified, be a compleat Minister, to
preach the Gospell authoritatively by way
of Office, and to administer Sacraments?
This we know, is true in fact, of many
this way: some things more there are
in that Section, very considerably wor- Sect. 3.
thy of an answer; but he is not pleased
to take notice of them.

In the next place, he comes to his
opinion "of the personall in-dwelling
of the Holy Ghost in believers, and will
neither admit of my explication of his
former words, nor acknowledge any
difference of his judgment now and
then. I have not yet had leisure to
consider what he hath published upon
this

this head (not having his book), but
cannot yet be convinced, to be of h
judgment, nor many others more ju
cious : I thought I had assigned so
cleer differences in the words compar
together ; but he will not accept m
paines. I shall now tell him of one
two ; 1. His judgment now is, that t
Divine nature, or the Spirit of G
dwells personally in believers, and th
the Spirit is the *Soul* that anima
Christ and believers : but then, I sa
the union of Christ and believers m
be *personall* ; for so is the union of So
and body in man, So is the Union
the Divine and humane nature in Chri
2. He said his former tract, that the sa
Spirit is in Christ and us ; but with th
difference ; "*In him indeed dwelleth t*
"*fulnesse of it ; when it is bestowed on*
"*only by measure* : but in his latter,
Schisme, he saies the Spirit dwells *p*
sonally in believers ; but then (say I)
have the *fulness* of the Spirit, as well
Christ ; his *person* and *fulness* being
separable. I might add, that the *fulne*
of the Spirit, when ascribed to Christ
man, was not the *person* of the Spiri
(for then the person of the Spirit al
was interessed in the *Mediatorship*) b
th

fulnes of the *graces* of the Spirit, ich we have only in a measure, 1 *Cor.* ,8. "*To one is given the word of Wis-dom; to another knowledge; to another ith, by the same Spirit.* But if the irit *personally* be given to every be-ver, all these should be given to one n, even as to Christ. But I for-r at this time any more.

As for his calling *Ministers*, by the me of *Parochiall Priests*, it is not th contending: he puts it off, neat-, "*By what the Prelates esteemed and cal'd parish. Ministers* which might s very easily for an *excuse*, were it t, 1. that many of the same reverend *pi-men*, were then *Parochiall Ministers* are now; and ill deserved the name *Priests*. 2. That the same *pious* men d *Ministers*, are till this day mocked d scorned by his *Independent* way, by e name of *Priests*, and worse. I might de, that the Reverend Doctor speak ambiguously, when he saies, "*I never called the Presbyterian Ministers of par-ticular congregations Parochiall Priests.* e may, or some may interprete it, at he meanes, there were no *Presby-rian Ministers* in Parishes, under the Prelates; and then indeed he did not

call them *Priests*; but enough that.

For the remaining section of my *Appendix*, though there are many things, that deserved a better account from the Reverend Doctor; as charging him with *clear alterations* of his judgment and some *contradictions* to himself; he passes them over, "*some as impu-* page. 422 &c. "*some as full of reflections, sarcasms,* "*prognostications*, And besides, pro-fesses himself, since my exceptions, "*be of the same mind, that he was, with-* "*the least alterations.* Only in one thing (and the worst of all) he confesses a change; "*As to the liberty to be allowed* page. 44. "*them, which meet in private, who can-* "*in conscience joyne in the celebra-* "*of publick Ordinances, as they are p-* "*formed amongst us, I confesse my-* "*to be otherwise minded at present, th-* "*the words there quoted* (Sect. 16.) "*express.* That is to say, I do now al-low *conventicles*; of all sorts of Sects who cannot in *conscience* joyne in pub-lick in the celebration of ordinances as they are *performed* among us: For why should not all have the same li-berty of *conscience* (which all preten-d *Anabaptists*, *Quakers*, and all, as h-

leads for himself and party? And is not this obliquely to *brand* publicke worship, as faulty? But this is more than he pleaded for, in his book of *Schisme*: that every man must follow his own *light*, and so gather into new *Churches*, to the rending of the Church into a thousand pieces. Did ever any true stated *Church* suffer such disorder? Will he allow this in his own Church? Do they not bind all their *members* to continue with them, and not to forsake them? Sees he not sufficiently the *mischiefs* of such liberty of private *conventicles*? are they not the *Seminaries* of *faction*, *Schism*, *Errors*, *Blasphemies*, and abhominable profaneneſſe. Let him answer his own *cautions* and *objections*, with his judgment formerly upon them; with his own *Latine* discourse, against such *liberty* pleaded for, by the *Remonstrants*. Does he not see men *pride* themselves of their gifts, and *create* themselves Pastors in separate congregations? Tells us he not, that such doings, "*will help to overthrow the very* page. 53. "*constitution of any Church, by confusion*; "*or the flourishing of it, by Ignorance*; "*both which certainly follow such cour-*"*ses*? Sayes he not well; "*This may*

"*be a means for men to vent their* [illegible]
"*private fancies to other*; *to foment* [illegible]
"*cherish errors in one another*; *to* [illegible]
"*false interpretations of the Word*, [illegible]
"*being no way to prevent it*? How [illegible]
he answer these things? Do we not [illegible]
the event of that his *prophesie* dayly [illegible]
fore our eyes? And does he now com[illegible]
to *countenance* these things, and to *co*[illegible]
tradict himself, and yet tell us, that [illegible]
is of the *same mind* still that he wa[illegible]
and no whit changed? May we not [illegible]
to him, as his servants to Pharoah, *Exo*[illegible]
10. 7. with change of a word, "*Know*[illegible]
"*thou not yet, that* England, (*the Chur*[illegible]
"*of* England) *is destroyed*; or as th[illegible]
Disciples to their Master, "*Carest tho*[illegible]
"*not, that we perish*? But I forbear [illegible]
and because the Reverend Doctor stand[illegible]
so resolutely upon his *assertion*, that he [illegible]
not changed, but of the same mind he [illegible]
was fourteen years agoe; I shall now [illegible]
present to him and the Reader, a *Scheme*
of his *differences* from himself, then and
now; as followeth.

Dif-

...ty of Pastors & ...ple distinguished	Of Schism.	Review.
1. He spake of ..., as a col... pted, corrupted ...hurch in *Italy*, ...g. 40.	1. He saies, *Rome* we account no Church at all, *pag.* 156.	1. I do not believe, that Idolater, &c. had any authority in, or over, the Churches. *pag.* 26.
2. Gifts in the ...erson, and con... ent of peo... le, is warrant ...ough to make ... man a Preacher, in an extraordinary case only: *pag.* 15. and ...g. 40.	2 Denying our Ordination as sufficient, he saies, He may have that, which indeed constitutes him a Minister; *viz.* gifts, and submission by the people, *pag.* 198. in our case.	2. I am punctually of the same mind still, *pag.* 40. yet had said in his first Book, *pag.* 46. As to formall teaching is required, 1. Gifts; 2. Authority from the Church; if he do not here equivocate.
3. He made the Union of Christ and believers, to be mysticall, *pag.* 21. We are so parts of him, of his mysticall body, that he & we are become thereby, as it were, one Christ. In him dwells the fulnesse of the Spirit, it is given to us in measure.	3. He makes the union to be Personall, *pag.* 94, 95. It is in the person of the Spirit, whereof we are made partakers. *Ibid.* The form of the Church Catholick is the Spirit, whereby it is animated, as the body of man by the soul, *pag.* 95.	3. Am I changed in this? No, *pag.* 40. If the Spirit personally dwell in us, we have him in fulnesse as well as Christ, and not in measure. The union of soul and body is personal; the union of man and wife is mysticall, not personall:

4. In

Duty of Pastors & People distinguished	*Schism.*	*Review.*
4. In extraordinary cases, every one that undertakes to preach the Gospel, must have an immediate Call from God. *pag.* 28.	and 28. 4. Yet required no more of before, but gifts, and consent of people, which are ordinary and mediate Calls. *pag.* 15. Neither is there any need or use of an immediate call, *pag.* 33. Of Pastor and People.	Such is ours with Christ. 4. And to a sure a man, h is extraordinari called to it, h gives three wai 1. Immediate Re velation. 2. Cor currence of Scrip ture-rules. 3. Some outwar acts of provi dence. The tw last whereof are mediate calls, pa 30. Past. & Peop
5. The Church government, from which I desire not to wander, is the Presbyterial. *pag.* 42.	5. He now is engaged in the Independent way	5. As setled i the truth, which he is ready t maintain, *pag.* 36 and knows it will be found his re joycing in the day of the Lord Jesus. *pag* 37.
6. Men ought not to cut themselves from the communion of the Church, to rent the body of Christ, and break	6. He sales, Separation is no schism, nor schism any breach of charity, *pag.* 48, 49.	6. There is not one word in either of those cautions, that I do not still own and allow, *pag.* 44 Sure not without

Duty of Pastors & People distinguish'd	Review.
the sacred bonds of charity. pag. 48.	equivocation.
7. I conceive, they ought not at all, to be allowed the benefit of private meetings, who wilfully abstain from the publick Congregations, &c. pag. 51.	7. As to the liberty to be allowed to them, which meet in private, &c. I confesse my self to be otherwise minded. pag. 44.

CHAP. III.

A review of his and my Preface.

THe reverend Doctor begins this Chapter with a *complaint*, (as his Book is full of such, either *causlesse* or *needlesse*, complaints) of "*my repetition* "*of his words, of such as I could wrest,* "*by cutting off one and another parcell,* "*&c. to serve me, to make biting refle-* "*ctions upon them, with whom I have to* "*deal*. To which I shall return but this: 1. The *testimony* of an *adversary* is strong against himself; To turn the *point* of his own

own ſword into his own bowells, is a allowed way of *cleareſt victory*; and more than this, I have not done. That which a man *condemns* in another, may juſtly be applyed to his *ſelf-condemnation*, if he be *guilty* of the ſame crime. If not guilty, it concerned him to *diſprove* it, and clear himſelf, and not to talk of *biting reflections*.

2. If he could do the like from my words, As I doubt not, but he would "*dreſſe me up in the like ornaments*; ſo let him do it with *like reaſon*, if he can, and ſpare me not.

He firſt falls upon the *Donatiſts* principles, improved not onely by *Romaniſts*, but by others, whom, I ſaid, I yet named not; but (ſaies he) *its evident whom he means*; though hereafter he tels us, he knowes not *whom I mean*. What thinks he of their *two principles*, by me expreſſed, are they *ſchiſmaticall* or no? To give me ſatisfaction, (though with little hope of ſucceſſe) he profeſſes ingenuouſly, 1. "*If they were conſidered* "*in reference to the Donatiſts, who owned* "*them; I ſay, they were wicked, corrupt,* "*erroneous principles, tending to the di-* "*ſturbance of the communion of Saints,* "*and evertting all the rules of love, &c.*

But

ut then I would say, 1. What is the *disturbance* of the communion of Saints, d *everting* all the rules of love, but *hism*, by his own definition of it? and t it was not in a *particular* Church, t from the *Catholick*. 2. If others *ouse* the same principles, are they ot as wicked, corrupt, erroneous, and *hismaticall* principles in them, as in e *Donatists*? Thus they are improved y *Romanists*, *Brownists*, *Anabaptists*, nd some more strictly called *Independents*. 3. And then I desire to be satisfid; why he (to free his own *party*) laoured to excuse them from *schism*, hough he seem to make them otherwise *criminous*; let him consider, if he id not endeavour it. The objection was, that *Austin*, and others, charged he *Donatists* with *schism*, for departing rom the *Catholick Church*: What saies he reverend Doctor to it? this; "*I* "*shall freely declare my thoughts, con-*
"*cerning the Donatists, which will be* Of schism,
"*comprehensive also of those other, that* Page 164.
"*suffer with them in former and after*
"*ages, under the same imputation*: That is, unjustly called *schismaticks*, for the like separation. And in delivery of his thoughts of them, charges them with

other

other errors, but not with *schism*, i
pag.168. their separation. "*To relinquish the c*
"*tholick visible Church, is not schism, b*
"*a sin of another nature.* Upon wh
ground, does he exempt them fro
schism, (as well as *Protestants* and hi
self, by *Romanists* so charged) upon
new notion of schism? "*I take schi*
"*in this argument, in the notion and se*
"*of the Scripture precisely, page 19*
That is, for *division* of judgment in
particular Church. But the *Donatists*
vision and separation, was in and fro
the *catholick Church*; *Ergo*, no schis
And yet behold his unhappiness, eith
in his *forgetfulness*, or in his *inconsis*
ency, to his own principles! He seems
me to acknowledge their *schism*, a
them *schismaticall*, in their separation
when he asks me angrily, "*Do I ple*
Review, pag.120. "*for them? do I labour to exempt the*
"*from schism?* Let the Reader judg
2. "*If he intend my judgment of them*
"(those principles of the Donatists) i
"*reference to the Churches of England*
"*which he calls Independent, I am sorr*
"*he should think, he hath any reason t*
"*make this enquiry. I know not that ma*
"*in the world, who is lesse concerned i*
"*obtaining countenance to those principles*
"*then*

hen I am. A fine *evasion* to save him-
f; let his Churches *shift* for them-
ves. I did not ask his own particular
dgment, in *reference* to himself, (for
id not yet charge him to *hold* those
inciples) but in reference to many
dependent Churches in *England*, which
n those principles, and *practise* ac-
rdingly. And he answers for himself,
at he "*is not concerned, in obtaining*
countenance to those principles: obscure-
enough. But its known too well,
at many *Independent* Churches do af-
rm themselves, to be the *onely Chur-*
hes in *England*, and none to be *true*
embers of a Church, but such as are
pyned in *membership* by a *Covenant*;
hich are the same in substance with
hose of the *Donatists*, and equally now
anted, I think, to be *schismaticall*.

But what thinks he of our *Churches*?
For my part, I acknowledge the Chur-
ches in England, Scotland, *and* France,
&c. to be true Churches: Such, for
ought I know, may be in Italy *or* Spain.
must professe, that if this was *sincerely*
poken, I should *rejoyce* much in these
oncessions, in this vindication of him-
elf; but the words are so *ambiguous*
hat I know not well, by which *handle*

to

to take them. I ask, Do all *Indepen*
Churches in *England* think so of the
I believe they will under-write, *Ma*
ster hic non tenetur; and rather *renou*
him, then *assert* so much of our *Ch*
ches. Do they not many, yea most
them, account us *Antichristian*, as w
said above? Do not his own princip
contradict his present *concessions*? An
would ask, If we be *true Churches*, w
do they and he *separate* from us? The
most of them for certain, do separ
from us, as no *Churches*, no *Minister*
doth not he so too? No; "*I have un*
"*niably proved in my book of Schism*,
"*have separated from none of them*. Th
was spoken to above; and I shal take hi
for no *Independent*, if he do not separa
from our Churches. But I pray, did h
not plead for others, his *party* as we
as himself; "*We have separated from no*
"*of them*? from no *true Churches* i
England; why? because they are no *tru*
ly constituted Churches; or, they *were ne*
ver members of them, and so could no
separate from * *them th*
were not: See *page* 257
Or, not *reformed accor*
ding to the mind o
Christ. This evasion he
learned

* *See pag. 252. s. 35. It is impossible a man should offend against that which is not, unlesse they will say, We have separated from what should be.*

spoken above, in this present
paper. But this will come again
long, there something shall be said
to it.

When I said, that a *learned Doctor*
said, "*His whole Book, or the greatest*
part of it, was one great schism: He
answers, "*I hope that is but one Doctors*
opinion, because being nonsense, it is
not fit it should be entertained by many.
That that one Doctor said, many
more do think; nor is it any *nonsense*,
but usuall *Rhetorick*, to Scripture, and
other Authors, so to speak, to call a
very *schismaticall* book, a schism, as to
call *profligate sinners*, by the name of
sins, and the like. The rest of this
chapter, and the most *substantial* things
therein, wherein I required *satisfa-*
ction, he overlooks; as those of *enforcing*
conformity on the one hand, and *tole-*
ration of Religions on the other, which
he pretended to be one of them, the
way to peace; and some other pra-
ctises of *Politicians*, with the *successe*
thereof, he thinks not good to take
notice of, or to discover which of the
waies he likes best. And after some

remnant of his former complaints, *suppositions*, and *many notable lies* &c. he concludes this Chapter thus: "*So his first Chapter is discussed and forgiven.* By which *begging* of the question, he would perswade both *himself*, his *Reader*, and *me* also, that I am very *guilty*, and himself very *charitable*, to *forgive* me, as I note above.

CHAP. IIII.

Of the nature of Schism.

FOr the better finding out of the true nature of *Schism* in the *Ecclesiastick* sense and use thereof, I condescend to follow the Reverend Doctor to take the *notion* or *notation* of it, first in the *literall* and proper sense. There it is taken for a *division* or separation of a *body* in parts which all men know, may admit *degrees*; and be either *partiall* when the *separation* or rent is partiall, the parts yet cleaving together for all that rent

totall, when wholly and quite divi-
ded asunder. *e. g.* In a *cloath* or gar-
ment *cut or torne*; it may be so cut or
torne; that it may hang together by
some *threeds*, or else be divided into two
distinct parts. Now it were ridiculous
to say, if the *cloath* be rent, and hold by
some *threeds*, it is a *Schism*; but if it be
cut or torne asunder, it is no *rent*, but
some other thing. The scripture, as well
as sense, intimates these *degrees* of
schism, when it sayes, the *rent is made*
worse Matth. 9. 16. 2. There is a body
politick, a City, or kingdome; and a
schism may arise in them, either in part,
as when their *Judgments* are divided, at
some publick *assembly* as Joh. 7. 43. &c.
Or else when they are divided into
parties, and fall into a *civill warre*; both
these met in the case of *Jerobeam*; first
there was a *division* in judgment, and
presently after a *secession* of parties;
which divided the kingdome into two
parties, and made two *kingdomes* of one;
and the latter was far the *worser schism*.
And it were ridiculous in *politicks* to
say, the first was a *schism* or *Sedition*, the
other none; yet this is asserted by one, Lud. Moulins
in defence of the *Reverend* Doctors no- Coroller.
tion of *Schism*; as well as by himselfe, pag. 101,

3. There is a *body Ecclesiastical*, whether the catholick *visible* Church; called the *body* of Christ: or a *particular* congregation, which is a *lesser* body. The same degrees of *Schism* may fall here, either *differences* in judgment, at or without a publick *Assembly*; or *separation* into severall Churches: and it were equally *ridiculous* (as afore) to say, division in the *assembly* is a *Schism*; but *separation* into severall churches, upon those *divisions*, is no *Schism*. Yet this our Reverend Author, does assert; it may be some other *crime*, but *Schism* it is not, p. 51. "*Other crimes a man may be guilty of*, "*of Schism onely in a Church*. Whence it is evident, the Reverend Doctor *begs the question* from the beginning when he took it; "*To denote* (onely) *differences* "*of mind and judgment*, &c. *among* "*men met in some one assembly*, *about the* "*compassing of a common design*, p. 2. The ground whereof was; because the word is sometimes, (not always) so used in those places of Scripture by him cited. Whereas in the very *originall intent* of the word, it may and does import, a further *degree* of *separation*, into parties or Churches. And the *inconsequence* of the Reverend Doctor's *Enthy-*

memi

...hath already been discovered; *Schism in the places cited by the Apostle, was a division onely in a particular assembly; Ergo Schism in the nature of it, does not singular separation from a Church.*

To prosecute this a little further, I say that *Schism* in the *Ecclesiasticall* sense; signifies a *separation* good or bad, *blameable* or *unblameable*, according to the *Circumstances* (as is confessed by himselfe, p. 218.) which may be thus considered. *Schism* in the Ecclesiasticall sense, is either *voluntary*, or *violent* and forced.

1. *Voluntary*, which may be double, 1. from a *false* and *corrupted* Church, with which a man cannot hold *communion*, without communion in their sins and this is commendable, and commanded, "*Come out from among them*, &c. 2. from a *true Church*; which may yet be twofold; as first, a *simple successe-sion* of one or more, upon just *occasions*, to joyne with another, of the same *constitution*: or a *separation* into a new society, *disowning* the former, and *renouncing* communion with it. And this is called a *blameable Schism*, generally by all, even *separatists* themselves, who plead,

plead, they *seperate* only from a *false* or *corrupt* Church, not from a *true* one. If it shall be said (as it is by the *reverend Doctor*) we *separate* not from a *true Church*, but only from some *corruptions* in it, "*which we cannot in conscience joyn with, in the celebration of publick Ordinances as they are performed among us*, as he said, *p.* 44. The answer is, that that is a *misinformed* conscience, which will *rend* the Church, the *body* of Christ, by a *causelesse separation*, as to themselves, especially having done their *duties* to reforme that corruption, as far as lyes in them, according to *Matth.* 18. 15. &c. Nothing but fear of *sinning*, justifies such a *separation*, as is elsewhere proved.

2. *Violent* or forced, and that either by the *sinfull corruptions* of a Church, (with which a man cannot communicate without *partaking* in their sinns) being *imposed* on them by a prevailing party, to enjoy *communion* with them; or by *opposition* and *persecution*, when pious people, are either *driven* out, or *kept* out of communion with them, unlesse they will submit to those *sinfull Impositions*: And this *Schism* is the sin of those, that any way *force* it, and they

Church reformation promoted on Matth. 18. 15. &c.

the *Schismaticks*, who caused that ration. This hath often been ex- emplified in the Church of *Rome* our *Divines*; and the *Schism* justly at their door. Now our *Reverend* : 1. Denies any thing to be but a *Division* made by a mem- in a particular Church: 2. Confi- ly affirmes, that Separation from Church, true or false is no *Schism*: which means he justifies, not only own, and partie's *Separation*, but even the *Sectaries*, and the *Romanists* also, their *separation* from the *Primitive Catholicall Church*, in *Doctrine, worship* d *discipline*. They may be *Schisma- ks* for their intestine divisions, if ey will acknowledge themselves a *rticular* Church, not otherwise; for *chism* is only in a particular Church: d thus he, who undertook to *Vindi-* e the Church of *England*, and his *wn party* especially, from the charge d *crime* of *Schism*, by the *Romanists*, th justified them from being *Schis- matical*, because they are no *Church*. ut now upon the former grounds, we ay prove themselves to *Schismaticall*; By a voluntary *separation* from true hurches, (with whom, we dare say, they

* We say, this Schism lyes at their door, who not only have devi- ated from the com- on faith, themselves; but doe also actually cause, and attempt to destroy tem- porally and eternally, all that will not joyn with them therein: *Of Schism.* pag. 144.

they may communicate without sin
and so consequently, *causelessly re-*
ding the body of Christ: 2. By the
renouncing communion with us, rot
up a Church of another *constitution*, a
so *condemning* our Churches, *ipso fa*
as no truely constituted Churches
3. By keeping out *fit members* fro
their communion, unlesse they w
renounce communion with us, and jo
in a *Church Covenant* with them: Th
do not indeed drive us out by per
cution, (blessed be God it is not
their power; I speak of *Brownists* and
nabaptists and the *Quakers* & such like
I mean of the *hand*, but by *tongue* th
do abundantly; by their *cruell mo*
ings, and ungodly *railings* and *revilin*
and by their *hereticall Doctrines*, a
blasphemous errors, they keep us o
of their communion; and by *perswa*
follicite strongly, to make proselyte
and draw them into *separation* from th
Churches; which sure in *Scripturall* a
right *reason*, amount to an heino
Schisme in the Church. And how i
our best *Independents* are proceeded,
some of these, let them consider. I sh
give an instance or two, to make th
distinction evident. The first shall b
th

…t of Distrephes, in Scripture, which …e Reverend Doctor sayes, p. 79. of …his, "makes the neerest approach to …such a division, (from a Church) yet at …such a distance, that it is not at all to our …purpose in hand. Let us try that a …ute. I suppose the Reverend Doctor …ill not deny, but he made a *Schism* …that Church; but that was not all; …note the particulars; how he made …t only *divisions* in the Church, but a …ration from it: 1. "*He withstood the …Apostle, and received him not*: 2. *He …reviled him, prating against him with …malicious words*: 3. *refused to admit …those brethren (whom he knew to be fit …members) which he sent unto that Church …to be admitted*: 4. *forbad and hindred …those that would receive them*: 5. *and …cast them out of the Church*. As proper *Schismaticks* as the *Pope* himself. For (as …e proved) they are *Schismaticks*, who …cause others to *separate*, either by their …sinful *impositions* upon the conscience; or …*keep* them out being fit; or drive them …out by persecution, or cast them out by …*excommunication* unjustly, as wel as those …who *voluntary* separate themselves from …true Church. Next I shall suppose …case (which lately fell out in *NEW*

ENG-

ENGLAND, and may do in OL
ENGLAND) If the *Officers* of
Church, or the people (if the power
in them) shall raise *causeleſſe differenc*
with ſome one or more *members* o
Church, and unjuſtly *excommunica*
them and caſt them out of the Church
would not this *Church* be twice *Schi*
maticall? once in raiſing cauſeleſſe di
ferences in that Church, and then
unjuſt *caſting out* and ſeparating ſuc
from the Church, by *excommunicatio*
and is not here a *Schiſm* in ſeparatin
people from a Church? therefore *ſchiſ*
is more then a *diviſion* in a Church
The like may be ſaid, of keeping *fit mem*
bers out of a Church, denying them
communion with that Church, in th
publick *Ordinances* of God, unleſſe the
will *ſubmit* to Impoſitions of men, as
ſaid afore. And let the reverend Doctor
conſider, whether this be not *ordina*
rily done, by ſome *Independent* Chur
ches; and, if he can, deny it to be
ſchiſm, *&c.*

Having thus far diſcovered the *natur*
and extent of *ſchiſm*, I ſhall now con
ſider, what *exceptions* the reverend Do
ctor hath made to my ſecond *Chapter*:
And firſt, I am charged with *ignorance*;

"The

The reverend Author understood me not at all, in what I affirmed. Truly I thought I had understood him, and others so understood him as I did; and if we mistook, it was long of himself. He said, "The thing whereof we treat, is a disorder, in the instituted Worship of God; that is, as I understood it, and others with me, either in the *matter* of instituted worship only, (and in nothing else) or only in the *time* of celebrating instituted worship. Both these parts of his words were given me by himself; the first, in *Sect.* 23. "The differences must be occasioned by, and do belong to some things, appertaining to the worship of God. Who would not take it thus, *Schism* is a difference made in the worship of God? The other, *Sect.* 9. "It lies wholly within the verge "of one Church, that met together for "the worship of God, &c. And *page* 25. in generall, "It denotes differences of "mind and judgment amongst men, met "in some one Assembly, &c. Which he repeats again in his *Review*, *pag.* 56. "Differences amongst men, met in some "one Assembly, &c. and gives it for the importance of the word. Let's now hear his own sense; "I say not, that schism "in

"*in the Church, is either about institu*
"*Worship, or onely in the time of Wors*
"*but the thing I treat of, is a disor*
"*in the institu*
"*Worship of Go*
"*and so it is,*
"*the being*
"*constitution*

See pag. 91. By the Worship of God I intend, the whole compasse of Institutions, and their tendency thereto, &c. If he speak properly now, I am sure he spake obscurely before.

"*any Church, be a part of Gods Wors*

Had he thus expreſt it at firſt, I profeſ (and ſo do others) I ſhould leſſe h underſtood him; for what means he That *ſchiſm* is onely a *diſorder* in t *diviſions* of mind and judgment, abo the *being* and *conſtitution* of a Church and that as it is a part of *Worſhip*? I ap peal all Readers. Who, but himſelf would have found out this *myſtery*, i thoſe words? Said he not, *pag.* 2 "*They had differences amongſt them*
"*ſelves, about unneceſſary things*? Is th *inſtitution* of a Church, as a *part of Wo ſhip*, an unneceſſary thing? The queſtio was, whether *ſchiſm* import onely *difference* in one Aſſembly, and do no imply alſo, a *ſeparation* into parties, up on thoſe diviſions. Hear what he ſaies pag. 54. "*I do here inform him, that if he ſuppoſ*
"*that I deny that to be a ſchiſm, wher*
"*there is a ſeparation; and that becauſ*
"*ther*

there is a separation; as if schism were in its whole nature exclusive of all separation, and lost its being, when separation ceased: he hath taken my mind as rightly, as he hath done the whole designe of my book: That is, I understood him not at all. I must confesse, I did so suppose, that he did deny *separation* to be *schism*, restraining it (as he did oft) to divisions in a Church, not allowing separation from a Church, true, or false, to be a *schism*. Well then, he grants some *separation*, and because *there is a separation*, is a *schism*; and so we are agreed. No, because I have not *proved* it, (from the places cited) "*I am desired not to make use of it.* Let us review the places cited by me and him; I shall instance onely in two, the first, Act. 14. 4. "*The multitude was divided, and some were with the Apostles, and some with the Jewes*: That is, said I, they divided into parties. The reverend Doctor approves not this criticism; "*The utmost intended, seems to be, the siding of the multitude, some with one, some with another, whilst they were in a publick commotion.* Let the Context be consulted. I said something to it, in page 40. and now I add; It seems to pag 35.

to me to be meant of *schism*, in an *Ecclesiasticall* sense, (though by him brought as a *politicall* schism, *page* 24. for thus it stands: The *Apostles* entred into the *Synagogue* of the Jewes, *vers.* 1. (which was a *Church-Assembly*) there a *commotion* or dissention was made, by the unbelieving *Jewes*, against the *brethren*, *vers.* 2. whereupon the multitude was *divided*; first, in *minds* and *judgments*, ἐχίθη τὸ πλῆθος; then into *parts* or companies, and some were with the *Apostles*, some with the *Jewes*; which cannot wel be meant of, being or *sides* with the Apostles, in *judgment* onely but in *society* also; as the like phrase is used in a like case, in a *difference* between the *Philosophers* at *Athens*, and *Paul*, *Act.* 17. 33, 34. "*Paul departed* "*from them. Howbeit certain men clave* "*unto him, believed, &c.* Clave unto him, not onely in their judgments, but in their *company*, following him upon his *departure*. This will be more evident in the next Text. *Act.* 19. 8, 9. "*Paul entring into the Synagogue* "*spake boldly for three months, &c.* But "*some being hardned, and unbelieving,* "*speaking evill of that way before the peo-* "*ple; Paul departing from them, separa-*

"*ted*

ed the disciples, teaching daily in the school of one Tyrannus. Which *schism of separation* was *violently* forced by the ibulent *Jewes*, as I said of the other lance *pag.* 41. And so the sin of that hism, was justly *imputable* to those ews, *driving* out the Apostle, and cing that separation. All that the re- rend Doctor saies to this instance, is, t I confesse in the *margine*, that *the word there used, is* ἀφορίζετε, *which hath no relation to* Χίσμα. But that's othing to the purpose; for *Paul* was ot guilty of that *schism*, but the *Jewes*, ho enforced him to make that *separa-* *on*, as I said above. The *Romanists* are udged *schismaticks* by ours, because ey *drove* and *cast us* out of communi- n, by such like *dealing* with us.

Both the words signifie to separate, or part into pieces, as Synonyma's.

I confessed indeed, that in the *Eccle- astical* sense, the *word* is onely used in e, 1 *Cor.* 1. 9. &c. (I except now he places newly mannaged, where the ne hath the *word* and the other the *mat-* of Schism) but I do not confesse that *therefore from thence the proper use and importance of it, is to be learned,* This is upon me; for I rather say, the full portance of the word, is not here to e learned: the word in its proper no- *pag.* 56.

tion, signifies a *breach of union*, or a *separation* into parts; in what *degree* soever. And that the Reverend Doctor beggs the question is evident, because he inferrs, "*That Schism being so often seen in those places, Ergo it signifies more in the nature of the word, or thing.*" He knowes, I denyed both the *Antecedent* and the *consequence*; the *Antecedent* by manifesting that there was more in their *Schism*, than onely a *Division* of minds: there was division into *parties*, a separation with respect to severall *Ministers*, I am of *Paul* &c. and to one *Ordinance* at least, the *Lords supper*: the *Consequence*, because the word signifies besides, any sinfull *breach* of *union*, by *separation* from a true church. For the *Anteeedent*, he answers; first to that of *betaking* themselves to divers *Ministers*;

pag. 67. 3. things, 1. "*It is not separation in the Church, by mens divisions, continuing members of that Church, that he denyed to be charged with Schism.*" But if there was any *separation* in the church, that more than he did grant at first; and made *Schism* onely a division of mind in that Church; and if he grant any *separation* in that Church, its as much as I desire; for I undertook to *prove*, there was more

among

mong them, than a *bare division* of
inds, a degree of *separation*, which the
postle there charges, *as part* of their
hism; and this the Reverend Doctor
r manner yeelds, *p.* 58. For when I
d, granting him his speciall *notion*, this
the way on one hand to free all
urch-separation from *Schism* &c. He
swers "*This is denyed*: which to me
ports, that some *separation* from a
urch is *Schism*; which is contrary to
s *notion*, that *Schism* is nothing but a
vision in a church, 2. "*The disputes
amongst them (sayes he) about Paul and
Apollo's, cannot possibly be understood to
relate unto Ministers of distinct congre-
gation among them; Paul and Apollo's
were not so, and could not be figures of
them that were.* But theres little weight
this, when as the *Apostle* first sayes
pressly; "*He had in a figure transferred
these things to himselfe and to Apollos* 1 Cor. 4. 6
for their sakes &c. And then the
fference of *gifts*, that was in *Paul* and
Apollos might suffice to make up that
gure, as the Apostle addes; "*That
ye might learne in us, not to think of
men (your Ministers) above that which
is written; that no one of you be puffed up
for one against another*: see, Chap. 3. 5.

3. He addes "*Men may cry up some*
"*one Minister of one congregation, some*
"*of another, and yet neither of them sepa-*
"*rate from the one, or other, or the con-*
"*gregations fall into any separation.* It
may be so; but its very *rare* to find it so;
and in this case of that Church, where
there were "*envying, and strife and di-*
"*visions,* Chap. 3. 3. about their *Mi-*
nisters, its most probable it was not so,
but people might and did *chuse* their
owne *Teachers,* with neglect, and *sleight-*
ing of others: sure we are, we find it
now; many by *having mens persons in ad-*
miration, have separated from our
Churches, by *crying up* some one *Mi-*
nister, some another, and *renounce*
communion with us. Its very probable
it was so then; men that had *itching*
eares, heaped to themselves *Teachers*
after their owne *lusts,* 2 *Tim.* 4. 3.
This breeds *envyings* and *strife* among
Ministers, when others *steale* away the
Members, and bring sleightings and *con-*
tempt upon their persons and *Ministry*
and at last, a *lamentable separation,* as we
see at this day. What ever he sayes
against that *probability* of separation, is
little worth; for I did not undertake
(as I said) to prove a *separation* from

that Church, but a *separation in* that Church, as to some *Ordinances*, viz. the *Ministry*, and *Sacrament* of the supper; of which in the text.

I said, there was a *separation* as to *parties*, in that Church, at least as to one *Ordinance* of the Lords supper: The answer is, "*It is acknowledged there* pag. 69. "*were disorders among them in the administration of the Lords Supper; that* "*therein they used respects of persons:* "*they tarried not one for another: That* "*they separated into several congregations,* "*not in the least intimation signified.* This is as *much* as I undertake; that which he calls, *using respect of persons* in that *Ordinance*, excluding the poor, that I call a *separation*, (not from) in that Church, as to a *party*: This was certainly part of their *schism*, rebuked by the *Apostle*. We see this done at this day, not onely by some of his *party*, who will sometimes hear with us, but not *receive* the Sacrament with us; but also by some of our own, (if we may call them so) who admit all their Congregation to *prayer* and *preaching*, but for the Lords Supper, *separate* themselves into another Congregation: Is not this a *schism*? He knowes whom I mean. That

That in the Church of *Corinth*, thereabouts, there was more then one *single Congregation*; I proved, first, from himselfe, who said, They had *sidings* in their solemn *Assemblies*; not one, but many. He evades this, by saying, "*suppose, one particular Congregation* "*may have as many solemn Assemblies* "*as there are times wherein they assemble*. And may it not be true also, of the *several places* of their meetings? For that the *numerous* company of Believers at *Corinth*, could all meet in one *place*, is most improbable, if not impossible. Besides, the reverend Doctor will not deny, that the *Epistle* was written to the Church of *Cenchrea*, a distinct Church from that at *Corinth*; then were there at least two *distinct Assemblies*. To which he saies onely this; "*Is there any* "*mention, that that Church made any se-* "*paration from that of* Corinth? &c. That was not to the purpose; I brought it to prove, there were more particular Churches in *Corinth*, or thereabouts; and that, it does perform. Now is it probable, that there should be a *Church* in that little *Village*, and but *one* in that great City of *Corinth*, where were *innumerable* believers? I instanced there-

pag. 61.

fore

ore in that 1 *Cor.* 14. 34. "*Let your women keep silence in the Churches.* Not ne, but many Churches at *Corinth.* It ay be, he will answer as afore, with re- ect to the several *times*, not the several laces of their meetings: But that is pre- ented, by that which I newly said. or sure, it might be applyed to the Church of *Cenchrea*, as well as to that Corinth, supposing it to be but one Congregation; "*Let your women keep si- lence in both your Congregations, when- ever they meet.* But enough of that.

He pretends indeed to have *proved*, and to be confidently *resolved*, it was but one *single* Congregation; for *proof*, I find none, but what I also suppose I had disproved, *page* 30. To some things whereof, he saies nothing: But he is so liberall, as to forego that proof. "*Is* pag. 63. "*it any thing to my present designe,* "*though there were twenty particular* "*Congregations in* Corinth, *supposing* "*that on any consideration, they were one* "*Church?* And here he assures me, he is more *troubled* with my *not understan- ding* the businesse, and *designe* he ma- nages, then with all my *reviling terms.* The like he redoubles, *page* 72. "*And* "*will suppose the Church to be of what* "*kind*

or kind I please, if I will acknowledge it to be the particular Church of Corinth. As for my *revilings*, the charge is unjust, and I have said enough to it. But Did he consider the *prejudices*, that will fall upon his *cause*, when he grants these things? For

He defined Schism, to be a causelesse difference, amongst the members of any particular Church, that meet together, or ought so to do, for the worship of God, and celebration of the same numericall Ordinances, &c. Of Schism, pag. 52. Can a particular Church, of many Churches, so meet together, to the same numericall Ordinances?

1. Supposing there were *many Churches* in *Corinth*, and that but one Church, it would plead strongly for a *Presbyterian*, nothing for an *Independent* Church: That one Church was governed in common, by the severall *Elders*, the Apostle writing to them all. 2. Then it were easie to infer, what I have asserted, that the *differences* were not in one particular Congregation, but *between Churches* and *Churches*, about their *Ministers*. 3. That if a Church of *many* Congregations, may be *collectively* called one Church, then there may be *separations* of one Church from another, as well as *divisions* in a particular Congregation; and so *schism* will extend further, then he would have it. *e.g.* Supposing the Church of *England* to

be

Nationall in a right sense, and so
lled a particular Church, with re-
ect either to other *Nationall*, or the
iversall Church; can there be no
hismaticall separation made, from the
ationall Church of *England*, in the *fal-*
ge off of one or more Churches, to *A-*
baptism, or the like? but they must *se-*
arate from the Church of *England*, and
ne themselves to some Church in
Holland, or elsewhere? If there may;
hen, *separation* in a Church, as well as
eparation from a Church, may be called
chism: For I have proved, there was a
separation in the Church of *Corinth*, as
o some *Ordinances*, and that is *charged*
y the name of *schism*.

But to prevent my future mistakes of
is *principle*, he tells me, what I must
emonstrate, if I will evert it; "*That* pag. 65.
"*the schism charged on the Corinthians by*
"*Paul, consisted in the separation from*
"*that Church, whereof they were mem-*
"*bers, and congregating into another, &c.*
No, that which I was to manifest, was,
1. That *schism* is more then a *division*
in a *Church*: Even *separation* from a
Church, is *schism*. 2. That there was
more in that *schism* at *Corinth*, then a
bare *division* of minds; there was, if not

a

a *separation from it*, into anoth
Church, yet a *separation* in it, as t
some *Ordinances*. Or rather, I was, 1. T
disprove his *new notion*; that *schism* is no
thing, but a *division* of minds in a Church
2. To prove, that supposing that *schi*
charged on the *Corinthians*, was n
more, but a *division* in a Church, ye
it followes not, that nothing else we
schism; which how I have performed
let others judge.

And now we are come to *Clement*
Epistle, written to the Church of *Corin*
forty years after, when they were agai
fallen into the like *schism*. That *schism*
the reverend Doctor said, was onely
"*the* difference in the Church. *Thi*
"*difference in it*, Clement *calls* ever
"*where, their schism*, Of schism, pag. 33
"*Nor are they accused of schism, for th*
"*deposition of their Elders, but for thei*
"*differences amongst themselves*: Which
may prove a great *mistake* of his, which
thus I demonstrate from *Clement*'s Epi-
stle: First, in generall, he calls it,
"*That abhominable and ungodly sedition*
at the beginning: Afterwards, brands
the Authors of it, "*The heads and lea-*
"*ders of a detestable strife and faction, in*
"*the pride and disorderlinesse of their*

"spi-

spirit; whom those *Corinthians* followed. And afterwards more particularly shewes, wherein that *schism* consisted; *viz.* in casting out of their *honest Presbyters*: "*Who have of a long time had a good testimony from all men: Such, we think, cannot with any justice be cast out of their Ministry.* And repeats again, and again; "*Foul, beloved, and very foul, are the reports, and unbeseeming, &c. that the most stayed and antient Church of the Corinthians, by the means of one or two persons, should rise up in sedition against their Elders. Indeed it will be no small sin unto us, if we cast off those, who have unblameably and holily, undergone the duties of their Episcopacy.* Then (a few lines between) follow those words, cited by the reverend Doctor, ὁρῶμεν γαρ, &c. "*For we perceive, ὅτι μετῳκίσατε, ye have removed some, who performed their Office well, &c.* How *removed* them? by *casting them out*, (as he said afore) or by *deposing* of them, as the reverend Doctor expressed it in both his Books. Now I demand, whether this *deposition*, or *casting out* of their *Elders*, be not the chief part of the *schism*, which *Clement* charges upon them? and whether it be not

not as great a *ſchiſm* in a Church, t
the people, to *caſt out*, or *depoſe* th
godly *Elders*, as *voluntarily* themſelv
to forſake a true Church, and to ſet u
another Church, by *ſubſtituting* oth
Officers in their places? which is mo
probable they did; though the reveren
Doctor would not take upon him t
know it, *pag.* 32. Of ſchiſm. This
ſuppoſed, to be intended in the wor
μεταγαγεῖν, which ſometimes ſignifies t
lead away, ſometimes to *drive away*, o
remove, or *depoſe*; as himſelf expound
it, by *caſting out*, a little before. Th
reverend Doctor underſtood it other
wiſe; "*What he meant by his* μεταγαγεῖν
"*&c. he declares in the words foregoing*
"*where he calls the Elders that were de*
"*parted this life, happy and bleſſed, as n*
"*being ſubject to expulſion out of their*
"*Offices.* But I doubt, the reverend
Doctor *miſtakes* the coherence, which
ſeems to me rather to look at thoſe for-
mer words, (thoſe by him cited being
rather a *parentheſis*) "*It will be no ſmal*
"*ſin unto us, if we caſt out thoſe, who*
"*have unblamably and holily undergone*
"*their duties of Epiſcopacy*; ὁρῶμεν δὲ ὅτι
γὰρ; for, or but, *we perceive*, that *y*
"*have caſt out, driven out, expelled, o*
"*depoſed*

deposed such from their Ministry, &c. this was their *charge*, this was part at least of their *schism*, and the *chiefest part* thereof. There was not indeed (for ought I perceive) "*any separation voluntarily made from it, by any of the* members *thereof*; but there was plainly a *separation* made by men, *acted by pride and madnesse*, in *casting* out, and deposing of their *Elders*; and they were the *schismaticks*, (as I said) that *forced* that separation. Let the learned judge.

The rest of this my second *Chapter*, for thirteen leaves together, the reverend Doctor thinks good to passe untouched, by some of his ordinary language; "*of my prejudices, mistakes, extravagances, reflections, mean affections to Independents; that I have not made the least attempt, towards the eversion of what he had asserted, &c. That I have not made good the title of my book, though I scarce forget it, or any thing concerning it, but its proof, in any whole leafe of my Treatise.* Which *imputations*, how false and *sleighting* they are, above all in my whole book, others must judge. Could I avoid *reflections* upon *Independents*, when I had to deal with him, who is an *Independent*, and pleads

pleads their cause? Did I onely intend to deal with him, and not rather with the *whole party*, whose *persons* he sustains, and interests himself in the judgment, when he commonly speaks in the plurall number, "*We have se-*"*parated from none of their Churches*" and many the like. And could I prove their *way* to be *schismaticall*, till I had vindicated the *notion* and nature of *schism*? Is not this whole *Chapter* spent in tendency thereunto? But he again complains; "*That I should so sleightly*" *passe over that, whereon I knew, that he*" *laid the great weight of the whole*." What was that whereon he laid the whole weight? Was it, "*That the*" *place to the* Corinthians, *is the only*" *place, where there is any mention of*" *schism in the ecclesiasticall sense*? Did I not (upon second thoughts) instance a place or two, (which I have now more enlarged and confirmed) where the *word* was used in the one, *Act.* 14. 4. and the *nature* of schism implyed in the other, *Act.* 19. 8, 9. in an *ecclesiasticall* sense? Have I not clearly proved, that there were *more Churches* then one, in and about *Corinth*, to which that *Epistle* was written? And considering the *multi-*

titude

ds of Believers in *Corinth*, is it not probable, if not impossible, that they ould all *meet* in one place, to make e *Church*? Hath the reverend Doctor swered any thing to this? Was I to ove, "*That the evill reproved, was se-paration from it*? No, but that there s more then a *division of minds* in that *hism*, even a *separation* in it, as to some dinances; which if it be proved, as I lieve it is, confutes his new notion, *That schism in its* nature, *and in that* Church, *was nothing but a* division *of minds*, upon which the whole weight his *structure* is laid. But enough of is before, let others judge.

One thing I cannot but take notice pag. 78.
, "*That I would have it granted, that because schism consists in a difference amongst Church-members, therefore he that raises such a difference, whether he be a member of that Church, or any ther, or no, (suppose he be a* Mahume-pag. 43.
tan, *or a* Jew) *is a schismatick*. 1. Did not prove he might be so, both from is own description of *schism*, and also y an instance of those, that came from *rusalem*, and stirred up *divisions* in he Church of *Antioch*? 2. For his *pa-nthesis*, is it not otherwise professed by

by me, *pag.* 55. An *Heathen* cannot
a *schismatick*? Did not the revere
Doctor *wink hard*, when he would n
see this? After all this, he charges it
a *crime* upon me; "*That I plead for*
"*old definition of schism, as suitable to*
"*Scripture, after the whole foundation*
"*it is taken away.* How is the founda
on of it taken away? not by his *not*
of *schism*; for though that *schism* h
been onely a *division* in a particul
Church, with respect to their min
and judgments; yet it followes not, th
schism, in the full nature of it, is n
thing else. Let him prove the *consequ*
if he can, and not make himself *ridic*
lous to all *Divines*.

But did not I instance in other word
which may and do signifie *separation* i
to parties, as well as *difference* o
minds? and those used in the same pla
of Scripture. What thinks he of δι
χοστασία, 1 *Cor.* 3. 3. may not that signifi
pag. 39. a division into parties? What of αἱρεσις
made a *synonymon* by the Apostle him
self, 1 *Cor.* 11. 18, 19. with σχίσμα
"*I hear that there are schisms, for the*
"*must be heresies also amongst you.* No
I made it evident, that that wo
signifies *separation* into *severall sects*
no

not divided onely in *opinions*, but in *Schools* also, amongst the *Philosophers*; and why may not *schism* include as much? Besides, I gave other words, that imply a sinfull *schismaticall* separation; that, *Act.* 20. 30. Seducers, that speak perverse things, ἀποστρέφειν, to *draw away* disciples after them, from the Church. That of *Heb.* 10. 25. μὴ ἐγκαταλείποντες τὴν ἐπισυναγωγὴν, *Not forsaking the assembling of our selves together.* And that, *Jud. v.* 19. ἀποδιορίζοντες, *separating themselves.* All which imply a *sinful breach of union*, and a *causelesse separation* from a true Church; which is the old *definition* of *schism.*

There are many things more of great *importance* in this Chapter, which I cannot but think it hard measure, to be so sleighted and despised, as to an answer. But the reverend Doctor is so enamoured with his *new notion*, and so over-joyed with his εὕρηκα of invention, that if you will not *grant* him that, he professes, to look for no *successe* in his work, as I said above. But I shall justly require and expect, in his next undertaking, a better account of them. There is but one thing more I shall take

notice of, in the *conclusion* of this Chapter, that is, about the *aggravations* of *schism*: First, those that are given by others, which I *re-enforced*; not because I hoped, that he would *dispute* with me about them, (for I see, he can avoid disputing about things, of greater *concernment* to him) but because I found him disputing *against* them, as I thought, *causelessly*. Then for his own, he may, without any leave from me, lay what *weight* he will upon them; "*encourage*" (he saies) *by my approbation of them*. Truly, all the *approbation* I gave, was, that I could *agree* with him therein. But, to tell him the truth, it was rather, because they were *true*, than that they were so *pertinent* and *proper*, as those vindicated by me: For as for the three first, that it is a *despising*, 1. Of the *authority* of Christ. 2. His *wisdom*. 3. His *grace*: What hath he said, that is not *competible* to the *aggravation* of any other sin almost, as well as *schism*? The same aggravations may be applyed to our *civill dissentions*: The last indeed is the most proper, *viz.* "*Its constant*" "*growing to farther evill, in some, to*" "*Apostacy it self; its usuall and certain*" "*en-*

...ding in strife, variance, debate, evill ...mings, wrath, confusion, disturbances, publick and private, are also to be laid all at its door. And that's my ...gment, of their present *Schism*.

CHAP. V.

The reverend Doctor is still peremptory, that the *separation* of any ...n of men, from a true Church, or of ...e Church from another, is not ...sm; he means, «*In the precise signification of the word, and description of the thing, as given by the holy Ghost.* pag. 80.

...ides what is said, to disprove that ...le of the word, and description of ...thing, I shall now add; 1. He can...t say this of all *separation* from a true ...urch, for he hath granted some such ...e *schism*, as I shewed above, from ...58 page, where he saies, «*It is de...ed, that his notion of schism is the way, to free all Church-separation from schism: Ergo*, ...me *Church-separation* ...*schism*, as I conceive.

Who told him, that raising causlesse differences in a church and then separating from it, is not in my judgment schism? p. 147.

2. In the next page,

page 81. he saies, "*That separation fro*
"*Churches is oft-times evill, is read*
"*granted.* And before, he said, "*Ca*
"*lessely to separate, is no small evill*, p. 7
Then a *causlesse separation* from
Church is evill; and why? but becau
it *breaks the union* of the Church, whic
is the very *definition* of *Schism*, com
monly given. Which if it be true, ho
could he say indefinitely, the *separa*
from a true Church is not *schism*? F
no body saies absolutely, that all *sep*
ration is schism; but a *causlesse* separa
on is schism; upon this reason, becau
it violates and rends the *union* of t
Church, the body of Christ. 3. If
shall stick to the *notion* of it, in t
place of the *Corinthians*, that there w
onely a *division* in the Church, a
therefore *separation* from the Chur
is no schism, it is *incumbent* on him
prove that *consequence*, which yet
hath not done. In a word, I ask, W
is *division* of *minds* in a Church a *schi*
1 Cor. 1. 10. I believe he must answer, Because it
a *breach of union*, of Christs appoi
ment, who requires *members* of
Church to be all of *one mind*. And is
not an appointment of Christ, that
membe

embers of a Church be united, as to
e *performance* of the same *numericall*
rship? Then by *parity* of reason, it
llowes, that to *break* that union *caus-*
sely, is also a schism. Is not this a
nsense and worthlesse *vitilitigation* of
e learned Doctor?

I brought 1 *Joh.* 2.19. for a *blameable*
aration from the Church; *They went*
t from us, as (said I) is the manner of
hismaticall spirits; they stay not till
ey be *cast out*, but *go out*, and become
e head of a faction. He ventures to
y, *All Writers expound it of apostacy*:
ey may do so, but not excluding
hism or *heresie*; for the same phrase of
ing out is used, *Act.* 15. of those that
ised a schism at *Antioch*; yet were not
ey *apostates*, not denying *Christ*, but
oyning *Moses* with Him. But I contend
ot.

ἐξελθόντες
ἐξῆλθον.

He is as confident, that of the three
laces by him brought, for blameable
epartures from a Church, "*none of*
them come under the head of schism. I
aid, All, or some of them do. Here I
ust first rectifie a *mistake* in the reve-
end Doctor, which he pleases himself
ith; *viz.* That he (not consulting the

Errata's) reads *mind* for *include*. I ſai
Some of them *included* the nature
ſchiſm, at leaſt, as *precedaneous* to th
ſeparation. Upon which miſtake,
ſports himſelf, and adds; "*Whate*
pag. 82. "*the matter is, I do not find him ſpeak*
"*ſo faintly, and with ſuch cautio*
"*through his whole diſcourſe, as in*
"*place.* Truly I ſpake ſo *cautiouſly*, ſ
his reputation, not any end of my own
becauſe ſome, one at leaſt, of the place
ſpeaks of no *ſeparation* at all; *viz.* th
from 1 *Theſſ.* 5. 14. and 2 *Theſſ.* 3. 3,
as I prove to him; but he will not ſe
For the firſt, that of *Heb.* 10. 25. whi
he takes to be meant of *apoſtacy*; I pr
ved his miſtake from the *Context* cle
red, from others, and from himſel
who formerly gloſſed it, *neglecting t*
publick Aſſemblies; and alſo becau
apoſtates may be *ſchiſmaticks*, and ſom
thing more. For the third, *Jude verſ.* 1
I proved the ſeparation to be *ſchiſma*
cal, from the nature of the word ἀπο
μενοι ἑαυτες, and the judgment of lea
ned Interpreters: To all which, th
reverend Doctor thinks it *ſafeſt* to ſa
nothing. And I muſt tell him onc
pag. 86. again, "*It was not incumbent on me*
"*prov*

prove, that such a separation is called Schism in Scripture, and is as such a thing condemned. But that such a separation, hath the *entire nature* of schism in Scripture, though not the name, according to his first proposall; and that I suppose I have abundantly proved.

When I said, the *pinch* of the question is this, "*Whether a man, or more, may separate from a true Church, upon a true or false plea, of corruption in it, and set up another Church, &c.* He cries out, "*I do not know, that I was ever necessitated, to a more sad and fruitless employment, &c. Is that the question in present agitation? &c.* Was not this scruple started by himself? 1. In giving his *definition* of schism, to be onely a *division* of minds in a Church, and not any *separation* in or from it. 2. Did he not vigorously assert, in this very Chapter, pag. 77. Of schism; and here again, pag. 83. "*That for a man to withdraw, or with-hold himself, from the externall communion of any Church, upon plea of its corruption in Worship, Doctrine, or Discipline, &c. is not called schism, &c.* Did it not now come to be the cause of my question, which I rightly stated, as I

I thought, and others think, betwee[n] us and him, and his *Independent* associ[a]tes? Is not their *separation* from us, th[e] ground of all our differences? Can *com[-] mon honesty* disallow this stare of th[e] question? Or can he truly deny, tha[t] they have made any *separation* from us, or that they do not deny our Chur[-]ches? What was said afore, must be a[-]gain repeated; I spake not onely o[f] *himself*, but of many *Independent* Chur[-]ches. Neither was my question pro[-]pounded in *Hypothesi*, as respecting them; but in *Thesi*, of any *separation* from a true Church. Whether a man, or more, may *separate* from a true Church, &c. and set up another Church, &c. as afore. And have I not proved also before, that they and he, (if he stand to his principles) have, and do *deny* our Churches and Ordinances? Hath any man a face or conscience to deny this *charge*? *clamet Melicerta pe[-]risse Frontem de rebus.*

The remainder of his *Animadversions* on this Chapter, is for the most part nothing but a *repetition* of those things, which he hath often charged; of *mi[-]stakes*, and *surmises*, &c. which have

en once at least fully answered. I shall ely lay hold of his promise, twice ade; "*That if I can prove against him*, he should have added, or his party) "*a breach of any union, instituted by Jesus Christ, that with all speed, he will retreat from that state or thing, by which he hath done so, and* (in a kind of scorn) "*submit to the discipline thought meet by me, &c.* Truly I think, I have proved, hat they have *separated* from us, and roke the *union* of our Churches; and in o doing, (if he will, as he doth, acnowledge us *true Churches*) they have nade a *breach*, upon an union of Christs institution, without which, we re no true Churches. And now I shall xpect the performance, of so solemn a romise. But for the contract or condition adjoyned, "*That in my next re*"*ply, I deal not with him, as I have done* "*in my former, neither as to his person, nor* "*as to the differences betwixt us.* I shall promise, and have performed it; for upon *review*, of what I formerly have done, I find, that I have dealt *fairly* and *respectfully* with him, though perhaps *sharply*, as in a zealous defence of truth. And if he have (as he hath) dealt more

uncivilly with me in this, I shall n*ot* *retaliate*, but onely vindicate the truth as a friendly and *christian* adversary.

CHAP. VI, VII.

THat I may not multiply or conti*nue* *controversies* everlastingly, (as the reverend Doctor causelessely charge me) though there be some things said in this Chapter, not so accurately delivered but just acceptions might be put against them; yet I shall forbear to exa*gitate* them, and proceed to the next. And therein, because the main *substantiall* points of our difference are alre*dy* discussed, and many things repeated which have been spoken to, I shall onely make some *strictures*, or animadversi*ons*, upon some passages in every Chap*ter*, that the reverend Doctor may see what might have been excepted, and lest he should think himself *sleighted* or neglected, in my passing over the following Chapters, though he hath sleighted most of the *argumentative* part of mine, and many things of some concernment, that required an answer.

Pag.

Pag. 101. "*The union of the Catholick visible Church, in the profession of the saving doctrine of the Gospell, not overthrown by any of the miscariages, errors, or opposition to it, formerly recounted; the breach of this union is apostacy, and so no schism.* To which many things were answered by me, to which little is said; what is, shall be presently considered. That which I now add, is this: 1. That the reverend Doctor opposes *apostacy* to *schism*, as if they might not both meet in one. The consequence is like the former; It is *apostacy*, *Ergo*, it is no *schism*; whereas they differ (at least sometimes) onely in *degrees*. 2. That he supposes, that there is no *breach of union* of the Catholick visible Church, but onely *apostacy*, which is usually taken for a *totall relinquishing* of the Christian faith. 3. That in giving those three *properties* of apostacy, he also supposes, that any one of them *denominates* a man apostate. Whereas I have proved, a *breach* of that union may be, 1. When a man believes not some one, of the saving *doctrines* of the Gospell, and yet be no *apostate*. 2. That a Christian may be *scandalous*, and yet a member still, and

and so no *apostate*. 3. That a man m*erre* in some necessary truth of the Gospell, and *professe* that error for a time and yet be *Orthodox* to the rest, and no *apostate*. And in all these cases of difference, with the *Catholick* visible Church, there may be a *schism*, a breach of *union*, and no *apostacy*. To his questions then, I say; 1. I grant, that the *Catholick visible Church*, is a collection of all professing *Christians*. 2. To be of such, as *profess* the doctrine of the *Gospell*, and *subjection* to Jesus Christ. 3. But I do not say, that every *error* in doctrine, or *disobedience* to some command of Christ, is *apostacy*, or (as he calls it) "*a* dissolution (*totall*) *of the* "union, *as to the interest of any member* "*by it, in the body*. 4. I have, and do charge some degree of *apostacy*, upon some of those Churches, which are called *Independents*, and shall be able to defend my charge. 5. I do prove, that the *breach* of that union, if *partiall* onely, is not *apostacy*, (which is a totall forsaking of the faith of the Gospell) but rather a *schisme*, which in his own definition, is a *division* in opinion and judgment. Lastly, I have manifested

p. 94 & 99

more,

ore than so, that one of the *truths* of e Gospell, which all Christians are and to, is, the *joynt exercise* of the me *specificall* Ordinances, to *subjection* the same *discipline*; and, where it is ossible, to the *exercise* of the same *numerical Worship*, which himself granted, *Schism*, p. 205. s. 7. and again here, g. 109. when he saies, to my words oie; "*All this was expressely affirmed* "*by me before; it is all* * *virtually contai-* "*ned in their profession, so far as the things* "*are revealed in the Gospell.* Whereupon interred, that the denyall of the *members* of the *Catholick Church*, to joyne in the same *numericall* Ordinances, was *breach* of that union, and so a *schism*, and not *apostacy*. What excepts he to his own grants? "*Onely as to the celebrating* "*of the same numericall Ordinances, I* "*cannot grant, that they are obliged here-* "*unto, as formerly considered members of* "*that Church, nor shall, till this reverend* "*Author shall think meet to prove, that* "*particular Congregations, are not the* "*institutions of Jesus Christ.* If he mean by, *formerly members of that Church*, that professors, *quà professors*, of the same faith; or believers, *quà* believers, are

* *If every professor be virtually bound by his profession, to those duties, what needs an explicite consent to bind them again?*

are formally members, and obliged thereunto, he *granted* before what now he denies, *page.* 205. *s.* 7. of *Schism.* And what I believe *concerning* the *Institution* of particular congregations by *Jesus Christ* I gave him my thoughts in my former *page.* 131. *viz.*: the same which he granted; "*Every Christian is bound to be of* "*some particular Congregation, not of this* "*or that*: this is only of *Institution*; the rest is *prudentiall*: to which the Reverend Doctor said nothing in its place; let him now review it.

page. 111. He sayes, "*As for those in* "Act. 19. *which had not heard, whether* "*there were an Holy Ghost or no*; *its pro-* "*bable they were ignorant of the miracu-* "*lous dispensations of the Holy Ghost,* "*rather than of the person of the Holy* "*Ghost.* I shall onely returne, That whatever the *matter* is, I find him not so *cautious* in all his Books; its *probable, rather than.* &c. For the words are more plain and full, than to be so eluded; for they were baptized in *Johns baptism* only; who did not Baptize into the name of the *Holy Ghost* for ought appeares: and so they might not have heard at all, of the *holy Ghost.*

There

There are other particulars in his
apter deserving some *Animadversi-*
but either they have been spoken to
ore, or they are παρεργα to the busi-
e before us, and I shall not *draw the*
any longer.

age. 116. Onely something may be
d to what he sayes, of the subjects of
nit the Head of the Church, which I
d, some wicked men may be; He askes.
Are indeed those persons any better than
Mahumetans, as to Church priviledges?
hall their Baptism availe them? is it not
null to them? shall such Parents give
heir Children any right to Church pri-
viledges? All these were prevented
d answered by me, *p.* 95.96. of which
e Reverend Doctor takes no notice:
t repeates the same objections. And
ly askes, "*Doth the Apostle any where*
call such persons brethren? God forbid
we should imagine these things so to be.
hen as the Text by me produced
pressely calls such, brethren: 1 *Cor.* 5.
1. "*If any that is called a brother,* *be a*
fornicator, &c. If that may be eluded
e other cannot: 2 *Thes.* 13. 17.
Count him not as an enemy, but admonish
him as a brother. I expect that he an-
wer my arguments.

What use is there of excommunication, if wicked persons be no members of the Church, & are ipso facto unmembred, &c. as I said, *Page.* page. 96.

p. 119. He sayes, "*I am not with*
"*trouble that I cannot understand, w*
"*he meanes, by placing my words so, a*
"*intimate, that I say, not onely that*
"*Church of Rome is no particular Chur*
"*but also, that it is no Church at all ;*
"*though it might in his judgment*
"*mine, be any Church, if it be not a p*
"*ticular Church* : Surely the Reverend
Doctor cannot but understand the di
ference between saying, *Rome is no p*
ticular Church, and, no Church at all
The mist is of his owne making ; th
will not distinguish of the word *partic*
lar Church ; which may be taken eith
for a *national* or *patriarchal* Church, as h
himself it was, *page.* 121. of *Schism*; or fo
a *particular Congregation*, which is the
ordinary notion. Now though *ROM*
may be said to be no *particular* Churc
as a *Congregation*; yet it may be (and is b
others) taken for a *Patriarchal* particu
lar Church : which is much more tha
to say, it is no Church at all : But h
sayes, I affirme the same that he does, i
my *page.* 113. when I say "*the Hierarchi*
"*call Papall Church, is not a Church*
"*Christs institutions.* I meant (as I ex
plain my self elsewhere,) that the *Papac*

t *Papall* Church, and the Church of
OME, are two distinct things, differing
the *Leprosie* and the hand; yet I do not
y, the hand is no hand, because of that
eprosie; as he sayes, *ROME* is no
hurch, because its *Papall*, &c.

Page. 120. "*Do I undertake the cause*
of the Donatists? do I labour to exempt
them from Schism? are these the wayes
of peace, love, and truth, he walkes in?
appeal all Readers, whether he did not
bour to exempt the *Donatists*, from
chism, *p.* 164. though he condemned
ll their *practises* as other *crimes*? And
id he not undertake to *exempt* some
thers from *Schism*, (he knowes whom)
that suffer with them, in former and af-
ter ages, under the same imputation?
nd was it not upon his own new no-
ion; because *Schism* is only a *division*
n, not from, a particular Church? Yea
as it not *Schismaticall* for them, to
ast *Cecilianus* out of the Church, re-
ouncing communion with him, and
he Church of *Carthage* also? ibid. *p.* 17.
8. The World hath hitherto judged it
o; and the Reverend Doctor is now
ome off to that opinion, when he sayes
"*Do I labour to exempt them from Schism?*

which (the Rhetoricall Interrogatio affirmative, being resolved) is *negative* I do not labour to exempt them fro *Schism*; *Ergo* they were *Schismaticks* that separation. And once more, A sep ration from a true Church, is sometim *Schism*, as well as *division* in it; But h sayes, angerly it seems; "*Sir, I have no si* "*gular notion of Schism, but that wch Pa* "*long since declared*. I pray, what wa *Pauls* notion of the *Schism* amongst th *Corinthians*? was it, that (which i yours) that *Schism* was onely a *divisio* in a particular Church? no; but that the *Schism* was a division in, that Church (with a degree of separation in it, as to some Ordinances as I have proved) not, that that comprehended the full nature of *Schism*; and if "*the notion of* "*Schism was not at all under consider-*"*tion in reference to the Donatists*, I desire him to look back to the objection which he undertooke to answer; was it not the charge of *Schism*? if not that, what else? "*Not Schism, but the union* "*of the Church Catholick, and the breach* "*thereof*. And what is the *breach* of the *union* of that Church, (in his *notion*) but *Apostacy* from the truth of the Gospell?

And

And would this be a congruous *answer* to the charge of *Schism*; to say, the *Donatists* were not *Apostates*? Did they *renounce* the Gospel? Nothing lesse: but renouncing *communion* with the catholick *Church*, and making themselves the *only Churches* in the world, they were by all men in all ages till now, accounted not *Apostates*, but *Schismaticks*: But too much of that.

Page. 123. "*I and my party*, (*that's the* "*Phraseologie, this Author in his love to* "*union, delights in*) *have broken the union* "*of their Churches.* I pray, is it not as *equall* for me to call them a partie, as for them to *separate* from us, and make themselves a party, *renouncing* communion with us? They went out from us not we from them: But it is denied, "*We* "*have no more broken the union of their* "*Churches, than they of ours: For we be-* "*gan our reformation with them on even* "*termes, and were as early at work as they.* Let the READER now observe, whether the *REVEREND DOCTOR* do not either make, or *own* a *party*; (we) which he blam'd in me? But I adde: 1. If he looke at himselfe, he began not his reformation till after--44. when his Tract

of Pastor and People came forth, then he was a *Presbyterian*: yea till 46. when he preached before the PARLIAMENT; then he was a *Presbyterian*, and (as I hear) pleaded for that way: 2. If he looke at the *Independents* that went out of *ENGLAND*, they at first disliked nothing but our *ceremonies*, and desired no *Reformation*, but a *liberty* of *conscience* from those *snares*, as the rest of the honest *non-conformists* did, who separated not; a *Presbyterian-reformation* would then have contented them: but in a little time, the seeds of *Brownism* were sowed amongst them; and, for that, they were charged with *Schism* from the beginning thereof, by *moderate pious men* amongst us, 3. They (nor the Reverend Doctor) have not yet demonstrated their way to be a *reformation*, but a *deformation* of our Churches; though sometimes for *shame* of the World, they call us *true Churches*; which they contradict by separating from us, and *renouncing* communion, as Churches, with us: 4. when we began to reforme, (by *authority* of the *Magistrate*, which they did not) some of his party cast all the *blocks they* could in our way, and

gathered

gathered Churches from us. And though he deny it, that they (he saies, we) have *separated* from all the *reformed* Churches, as no Churches; and himself with them in his *principles*, if not in *practise*; is so fully demonstrated above, to all reasonable men, that I wonder that he should expect "*recompence and* "*satisfaction, for calumniating-accusati-*"*ons and slanders*, which are proved *truths*; and talk of his *forgivnesse* of one, that never wronged him. For the *parallel* of *Independentism* and *Donatism*, how much he or his party is concerned, let others judge.

Pag. 126. He *cavills* at my first proof, that there may be a *breach of union* in the Catholick visible Church, if the *form* of it were faulty. But what is wanting to make up a perfect *Syllogism*, might easily have been supplyed, from the former *discourse*, by himself, if he had pleased; thus: 1. *Schism* is the *breach of union* in a Church, of Christs institution: But the Catholick Church is a Church of Christs institution; *Ergo*, there may be a *schism* in the Catholick Church. 2. There may be *differences* in matter of faith professed, which is the *union* of the

Catholick Church; *Ergo*, there may be *schism* in the Catholick Church, which not arising to *apostacy*, must needs be schism, as I proved above: And he must *evade*, by one of those answers which I presented to him, *pag.* 115. or else must *beg the question*. For a close of this; Can there be any *breach of union*, in the *nature* of the word, in the *language* of Scripture, or in reason or common sense, which is not a *schism*, more or lesse, according to the *degree* of that breach of union? But to the second, he saies, "*Two professors may fall out, and* "*differ, and yet continue both professors* "*still*; Paul *and* Barnabas *did so*, *so* "Chrysostom *and* Epiphanius, *&c.* This *breach of union* in *Paul* and *Barnabas*, professors of no *particular* Church; that of *Chrysostom* and *Epiphanius*, of *severall* Churches: Was it not a *fault* in one party? both could not be in the right. What, will he call that *breach of union*? Surely not *apostacy*, (for they were, he saies, professors still) they were far from *renouncing* the profession of the Gospell, either of them. What then was it, but a *schism*, and sinfull *separation* in one party? And nothing

Act. 15. 39 ἐγένετο παροξυσμὸς, ὥστε ἀποχωρισθῆναι αὐτοὺς ἀπ' ἀλλήλων.

hinders

hinders to call it so, but onely the reverend Doctor's *new notion* of *schism*, to be onely a *division* in a particular Church.

Pag. 128. and the two following pages, are filled with little to purpose, but with charges, "*of evill surmises, reproaches, "false criminations, wranglings, impertinencies, bitterness of spirit, &c.* which are almost an hundred times repeated, but not once proved: He concludes with the *guilt* of one of my charges, that is, *falshood*, when he saies, "*I am glad "to find him*, pag. 120. *renouncing Ordination, from the authority of the "Church of* Rome, *as such: For I am assured, that in so doing, he can claim it "no way from, by, or through* Rome; *for "nothing came to us from thence, but what "came in and by the authority of that "Church.* I might cry out of *mistakes, calumniations*, or *equivocations*, &c. for neglecting to observe my *distinction*, given before and after; before: "*They "baptized and ordained, not as Antichristian, not as Bishops, or Romish Priests, "but as Presbyters.* After, in the next page; "*They did it as Officers, not as Officers of that Church, that Papall Anti-*

"*christian Hierarchy.* From whence I said, "*It is false then, that* (which he "had charged, pag. 199.) *that Ordina-* "*tion is pleaded, from the authority of the* "*Church of* Rome, *as such*: That is, as Antichristian. And I say again, his last words are false; "*That nothing came to* "*us from thence, but what came in, and* "*by, the authority of that Church*, if he mean, the Antichristian Church of *Rome*. To conclude, he often professes, he hath not *renounced* his Ordination, by an English *Bishop*; that *Bishop* had his succcessive Ordination from some that had it from *Rome*. Yet he could distinguish a double *capacity* of those Bishops, one as *Lord Bishops*, *pag.* 227. another as *Ministers* of the Gospell, &c. *pag.* 231. Now if he *renounce* not his Ordination, he will deny, that he received it from *Bishops*, as such; but from them as *Ministers* of the Gospell. And may not we distinguish so of the *Romish Bishops*? is it not ordinary for all our *Divines* so to distinguish? What *perversnesse* is this! The businesse about *Ordination* of our Ministers, required his judgment and answer; but he thinks best to wave it, though it was started by himself, *p.* 196.

Pag.

Pag. 131. I am causlessely *quarell'd*, for calling his *description* of a particular Church, a *definition*; and he saies, *He waved contests about accurate definitions, which usually tend very little, to the discovery or establishment of truth.* both which, I wonder at, in so great a *logician*: For 1. Is not a *description* in Logick call'd, an *imperfect* definition? The *contests* amongst men, oftentimes grow from want of a *perfect definition*. The true *Genus*, and proper *differentia*, being the cleareſt way to diſcover, and eſtabliſh the truth. And this is evident, by his own *deſcription* of a particular Church: Is it not a *definition*, conſiſting of a *Genus*, a ſociety of men called by the word; and a *differentia*, the *joynt performance* of the worſhip of God, in the ſame *individuall* Ordinances, &c? Did he not make the *form* of a particular Church to be, "*The* "*obſervance and performance of the ſame* "*Ordinances of Worſhip, numerically, &c.* pag. 236. And do not both thoſe make up a *definition*? Whether it be accurate or no, is now to be conſidered. And that it is not a *perfect* or full definition, or deſcription, appears from what I ſaid,

said, *pag.* 123. because it is applicable to the *Church invisible*, and to the visible Catholick Church, as well as to a *particular* Congregation. Each, or all these, may be described to be "*a society of men, called out of the world, by the Word, &c.* according to all the particulars of his description, as hath been evidenced by me, and acknowledged by himself above? And I added, "*That such societies are all our particular Congregations*; and so, as *true Churches* as theirs. To which he saies but this, "*That was not the thing in question.* If it was not there, it is (he knowes) a question between them and us; and my *reference* was rationall, from his description, A *particular* Church is a *society*, &c. But ours are such; *Ergo*, true Churches and consequently, not (without *schisme*) to be separated from.

Pag. 132. Concerning the *explicite covenant*, so much urged by them, he saies, "*I am not at all concerned in it; purposely waved all expressions concerning it, one way or other, &c.* But did he not give us the *form* of a particular Church, and the *union* of it, to consist pag. 215. "*in a joynt consent of the members, to walk*

"*to-*

gether, &c. *see* pag. 142. *of* Review?
not by them made the very *form* of M. Hooker *Survey*
particular Church, without which,
an can no more be a *member* of a par-
ular Church, then a *woman* can be
h a mans wife, without her *explicite*
sent? I noted the difference of his
testion; one while he said, The *form*
a particular Church, was the *joynt*
sem of the members; another while,
it is the joynt observance of all Ordinan-
ces of worship, numerically, &c. Now
evident, that these are not the same
ng; there may be a *joynt observance*
the same Ordinances *numerically*, by
embers of severall Churches, mee-
g together; yea, by members of the
holick Church, yet of no *particular*
urch, by *joynt consent*. And this latter,
joynt performance of the same Ordi-
nces of worship *numerically*, is the
m (if it have any) of a particular
hurch, differencing it from the other.
his diversity of *expressions*, the reve-
nd Doctor puts off; first, with a sleigh-
ng sentence, *Id populus curat scilicet*;
d then *evades*, by asking; "*Is it the* pag. 144.
command of Christ, that believers should
so do? Is not their obedience to that com-
"*mand*,

"*mand, their consent so to do? Is it*
"*the duty of every one, to joyne himself*
"*some one of the Churches? Can any*
"*do so, without his consenting so to*
"*Is this consent any thing, but his vo*
"*tary submission, to the Ordinances*
"*worship therein?* Let me ask but so
like questions; What's all this to
purpose? what to an *explicite* coven
or consent, which they require? M
not all this be done *implicitely*, and t
sufficient, in their own confession,
make a Church? Did not he say, "
"*this was virtually contained in their p*
"*fession so far, as the things mentioned*
"*revealed in the Gospell*, pag. 10
When a man first *professes* himself
Christian, he *virtually* and implicite
promises to do all those duties, whi
concern him, in any *relation* to his fello
members, and Minister: What ne
then, to lay so much *weight* upon an e
plicite Covenant, (unlesse sometimes in
prudentiall way, when a Church *renew*
the generall Covenant; or to bind m
faster, to what they were bound to b
fore, but neglected) I say, what need
there, to lay the whole *weight* of
Church-*constitution*, (as no Churc
witho

See p. 145. As an expresse consent, &c.

hout it) upon an explicite covenant
en the *implicite* is confeſs'd ſufficient.
eſe things ſhould not have been
ved, or ſleighted by him, that makes
form of a particular *Church*, to be
ynt conſent: by which, if he mean
an explicite conſent or covenant,
ſpeaks nothing to the difference be-
een us, and ratifies the conſtituti-
of our Churches, as well as his
n.

Ibid: "*I thinke no one ſingle congrega-
tion is wholly compleated according to
the mind of Chriſt, unleſſe there be more
Elders than one in it; there ſhould be El-
ders in every Church.* What meanes
by *Elders* in every Church? a *Paſtor*
d a *Teacher*? can he prove the *Apoſtle*
two ſuch *Elders* in every Church?
are both theſe ſo *neceſſary* in every
urch, that without them, it is no
hurch? Or does he meane, every
hurch muſt have, beſide thoſe two,
ling Elders in it? Can he prove there
ere ſuch at *EPHESUS*, Act. 20. 17.
d they ſent for, by the *Apoſtle*; He
eaks to them as more than one or two,
n all, v. 25. He may tell us in the next,
ow many *Elders*, according to the mind
of

of Christ, *compleat* a Church; and ho
Anat of Independent page. 26. he will reconcile the whole *differen*
as to their and our Churches: reme
bring this, that as Mr. *Simpson* had
Ruling Elders, nor did approve of the
in his Church: So I do not know wh
ther the *Independent* Church at Oxfo
have any such *Elders*, or no.

Page. 134. "*I am so farre from co*
"*firming baptism subjectively to apart*
"*cular Church, that I do not believe, th*
"*any member of a particular Churc*
"*was ever regularly baptized: Baptis*
"*precedes admission into Church-membe*
"*ship, as to a particular Church: the sub*
"*ject of it, is professing believers, and the*
"*seed, whether joyned to any particul*
"*Church or no.* I must confesse, I kno
not how to take these words: 1. I
seems at first sight to conclude, tha
himself and the generality of Christian
in ENGLAND were never regularl
baptized, being baptized all, in som
particular Church: 2. It sounds some
thing *Anabaptisticall*, that a Church i
made of *baptized persons*; baptism pre
cedes admission into Church member
ship, (say they also) as to a *particula*
Church; and denying *Infant baptism* to
be

valid, they *re-baptize* men, before they mit them members of their Church: This is contradicted by the brethren NEW ENGLAND, who make a *particular* Church only, the Seat of all dinances, and none to be *regularly bap-ed*, that are not baptized in a parti-lar Church: 4. The same is asserted himself; *page.* 106. of his *Review*: *particular Churches, being by the will of God appointed for the Seat of Ordinances.* Then, unless baptism be no *Church* rdinance of God, it must be done in a *rticular Church.* But he sayes, "*for his present mistake, I shall not complain seeing that some occasion may be administred to it; from an expression of mine*; hich we find to be this: "*Christ hath* "*given no direction for any duty of wor-*"*ship, but only to them and by them who are* "*so joyned*, Of Schism, *page.* 206. *s.* 10. Whereupon I asked, whether *baptism* was a part of worship? If so, how could e reconcile this with what he said a-ore, "*that members of the Catholick* "*Church are initiated into that profession* "*by Baptism*: For if a *professor* of the atholick Church only, may be baptized, ow is a *particular* Church, the Seat of all

Of Schism p. 85. 208. These churches were (by Jesus Christ) made the only Seate of that worship, which in particular he expressed his will to have continued untill he came, &c.

all Ordinanc[illegible]? and so to be *perform*[illegible] by them that are so joyned? To rectif[illegible] not mine, but his own mistake he no[illegible] sayes: "*Baptism is so to be performed* "*them, that is a Minister in or of the*[illegible] *Page.* 136. How easily might I mistak[illegible] when himself mistook, and lead me ou[illegible] of the way: And will this make me [illegible] ver the wiser? The thing he had to prov[illegible] was "*the necessity of every believer's joy*[illegible] "*ning to some one particular Church,* [illegible] "*enjoy the Ordinances of the Gospell*: Thi[illegible] he proves, "*because Christ hath given n*[illegible] "*direction for the performance of any dut*[illegible] "*of worship of Soveraign institution, bu*[illegible] "*only in them (the particular Churches*[illegible] "*and by them, who are so joyned.* He[illegible] mends it, still it is the worse again? If he would imply, that a Minister in or of a particular Church may perform those or-dinances, without those congregations (which onely was to purpose) he con-tradicts himself for saying, A particular Church, is the seat of all Ordinances: If he meane, those Ordinances of wor-ship, are to be performed only by a Mi-nister of a particular Congregation, what shall become of the people? and what made the words, *so joyned here*? Does it

not

ot concern them to w[illegible]ip God? Or
y a *Minister* perform any *acts of wor-*
ip out of a particular Church? That I
d, was denyed by men of his way, that
Minister is such to any more than his
n Church: He askes me; "*Who*
told me he denies a Minister, to be a Mi-
nister to more than his own Church, &c.
ge. 135. I have been told (and I pre-
me he will not deny it) that when the
earned *DOCTOR WALLIS*, had
ought to him as *Vicechancellor*, that
uestion to be defended *negativè*, in the
sers of the publick Act at *Oxford*,
654. "*An potestas Ministri evangelici,*
ad unius tantum Ecclesiæ particularis
membra extendatur, this Reverend
octor said thereupon, that *Doctor Wal-*
lis had brought him a challenge, adding,
hat if he did *dispute* upon that Questi-
on, he must dispute *ex animo*. And if this
e true, as I presume it is, what need I be
urther told, that he denyes a Minister
o be a Minister to more, than his par-
icular congregation? I have also been
old further (which I presume he will
ot deny neither) that when Doctor
Wallis's ? *Thesis* on that Question,

was since pri[illegible], this Revered Doctor did imploy, or at least encourage (an *Amanuensis* of his) Mr. *Stubbs* of Christ Church (now advocate for Mr. Hobs) to write against it: Though indeed, when that work written, was found a Scurrilous *ridiculous piece* (for so I heare, he is since pleased to style it) he did not thinke fit to let it be made publick, because (they were his own words,) "he "*would not have that cause suffer so much* "*as to be defended by such a Penne.* I have heard more, to this purpose, but I forbeare: Only I shall (to shew his *Inconstancy* to himself) let the *Reader* know how liberally he now grants, "*Ministeriall Acts may be performed not only* "*to the members of the Catholick Church,* "*but to the visible members of the world* "*also.* I leave him and his friends to *debate* and *reconcile* themselves one to another in this.

Page. 136. "*Prayer and reading the* "*Word in private families are parts of wor-* "*ship, but not meerely and purely of Sove-* "*raign institution*": These are expressely commanded, *Deut.* 6, 7, 8, &c? I shall not follow him in the rest; only whereas he complements with me in so high a mode;

Code; p. 139. "I would humbly intreat this reverend Author, to send me his reasons, whereby it may be confirmed, viz. that there must be particular Churches, of every professor to joyne with, one another, for the celebrating of publick Ordinances. I as humbly desire him to peruse my 132, *page.* &c. and to consider my reasons, if they be not as good as his and what therein is of *Institution.*

3. "*Preaching to convert Heathens is not* (as described) *a duty of worship in all cases; and when it is, it is to be performed by a Minister.* What meanes he by those words, *as described*? my words were; "*preaching to convert Heathens and then to baptize them*; is it not a duty of worship belonging to a Minister? is there any preaching properly so called, that is not a duty of worship? or may any do it but a *Minister? Rom.* 10. 14. In his *Tract* of *Pastor* and *People*; he allowed, in extraordinary cases, any man that had *gifts* and a people *willing* to hear him, to be a Preacher; Is that one of the cases, when preaching to convert Heathens is not a duty of wor-

worship, and not belonging to a *Minister*? Or is it that *parenthesis* of mine; (and then to *baptize* them, when converted) that makes it a *duty* of worship, and to be performed by a *Minister*? I humbly conceive, this answer is somewhat obscure, and satisfies not my fourth, concerning himself, when I asked, "*By what authority*" "*he himself Preaches, and Prayes in*" "*and with the Parliament, &c. Or are*" "*not those, there done, parts of worship*" which he calls an *invidious enquiry*, and so passes it by. It required an answer, whether he accounts those to be *particular Congregations*, that are *mixt* and *unjoyned*? Whether he performed those as *duties* of worship, as a *Minister*; and by vertue of what *Ordination*, if he have not renounced it, as, he saith, he hath not? especially, if he was not *Ordained* in a particular Church? Of which, in the next.

Pag. 138. "*My judgement is, that ordinary Officers are firstly to be ordained,*" "*in particular Churches.* I onely ask, in what *particular* Church himself was ordained? and if he was, whether he

did

did not first *renounce* his former Ordination by a *Bishop*, which he hath so oft enyed to have done? For I do not expect him to say, he is an *extraordinary* Officer. And if ordinary Officers be onely ordained in a *particular* Church, would be resolved, how he can do ny *Ministeriall* act, to any other *particular* Church, or to the Catholick Church, or World, which he granted bove? And then, how those that are *members* of that particular Church, are not confined to him, as well as he to them? *Pastor* and *Flock* being such *Relata*, as Husband and Wife. This piece of *Independency* was a matter of great contest in new *England*, by one that was *no child* in those things: whether the *practise* of those in old *England* be otherwise, I know not: if it be, I doubt, it is onely to such *members*, as are of some *Church* of the same constitution; which is something *lesse*, but no whit *better*, as to our *communion* with them.

Pag. 140. If the discourse about the *intercision* of Ordinances, and all *Church-state*, was an impertinency, it

was his own fault, to ſtart it thrice
pag. 85. and 211. and 271. and a great
fault to *waive* it here: Onely, we have
promiſe, "*That in convenient time,*
"*may offer ſomewhat further, towards*
"*the inveſtigation of the mind of God*
"*therein*; and it becomes me to wait
his leiſure: "*It is not a matter to be toſſed*
"*up and down, in this ſcambling chaſe.*
Yet, as I ſaid, he inſinuated in his
queſtion, that *England* was *unchurched*,
and the *Churches* planted here did ceaſe
to be; and tells us, by what act God did
unchurch them: But now *waives* to an-
ſwer all my ſeven queſtions, (which re-
quired an anſwer) but the laſt; to
which a ſufficient reply is made, (where
it was unſeaſonably brought in) upon
Ad. p. 21. his firſt Chapter, to which I refer him.
Onely I take notice, of his introduction
to his anſwer; "*with thanks for the*
"*civility of the inquiry, in the manner of*
"*its expreſſion.* My words were theſe,
"*whether our reverend Author do not in*
"*his conſcience think, there were no true*
"*Churches in England, till, &c.* which
puts me into a ſuſpicion, that the re-
verend Doctor was offended, that I did

always (for oft I do) give him that title, of the *reverend Author*, or *reverend Doctor*; which made him so cry out, *He was never so dealt with, by any party*, as by me; though upon *review*, I do not find, that I gave him any *uncivill* language, unbeseeming me to give, or him to receive: And I hear, that some body hath dealt more uncivilly with him in that respect, which he took very ill.

Pag. 148. "*For my part, I am not acquainted with those Independents, which allow no communion of Churches, but what is prudentiall.* It seems, the reverend Doctor is little acquainted with the *principles* of the *Independents*, in new and old *England*; yea, he considers not the very *name* of an *Independent* Church, which what doth it signifie, but an *Independency*, or *non-communion* of one Church with another, as *Churches*, as I noted, *pag.* 155. at least of *divine institution*. The rest, what is it but *prudentiall*, or *communion* of members of the Catholick Church? And I shall onely propound this to his consideration: 1. Whether if there be

any *communion* of Churches, as Churches, (which he grants, or else *equivocates*) there be not a *breach* of that communion and union, (and so a *schism*) "*When one Church refuses to hold the* "*communion with another, which ought* "*to be between them*; which before, and now, he denies: "*it is no schism, properly so called*: Unless he mean, it is not *properly* so called, with respect to his *new notion* of schism. But now he is upon the *common* notion of schism, a *breach of union* or unity; and then it is a *schism*, to refuse that communion, which ought (by divine appointment) to be between them. 2. They having acknowledged our *Churches* to be true Churches, and then some *communion* to be due to us, as Churches; how can they *separate* from us, and refuse *communion* with us, without a *breach of union*, and so without *schism*? unless he mean, they allow *communion* of their own Churches, by institution of Christ, but not with ours; no not so much as *prudentiall*, as Churches. 3. Many *Independents* (and the reverend Doctor with them) seem to hold, that *commu-*

nion

union of Churches by *Delegates*, in a *Council* or *Synod*, is onely *prudentiall*, and not of *Christs* institution; and then he may mean, there is no breach of union, in refusing to hold that *communion*, because it is not an union or communion of Christs institution. To conclude this, how little reason the reverend Doctor had, to cry out of *outragious injury* done him, in those words of mine; "*Is not the designe of his Book to prove, "if he could, and condemn us as no "Churches? Let the world be judge.* When he hath often told us, that in *separation* from us, they have broken *no union* of Christs institution; as I have often said. And here tells us, "*I have no more separated from "you, than you have done from me*: Which how unreasonably (I will not say, outragiously) *false* it is, I say again, let the world, and *Saints*, and who wil, be judge. And then consider, what need there was, of his "*forgivnesse*, "*of all my reproaches, revilings, &c.* which appear to be none. But though I am unjustly charged all along,

Of schism, pag. 218.

along, with such *miscariages*, the reverend Doctor "*shall have a place* "*in my heart and prayers.* And so much of his ninth Chapter.

Pag. 146. "*What Independency* "*is, he doth neither here declare, nor* "*do I know what it is that he intends* "*by it; the name is invidiously brou-* "*ched, and disowned by them to whom* "*it is ascribed, &c.* But 1. The reverend Doctor is very forgetfull, of what he saies; for he told us once before, *pag.* 47. "*Though he name* "*not that party, yet it is evident whom* "*he intends.* And once again, *pag.* 148. "*What Sect it is, any man may* "*judge, that takes the least view of his* "*Treatise.* My Treatise was intended against all *sorts* of *Independents*, and against himself as one of them; for they all plead their *Congregations* to be Independent, having all *Church-power* within themselves, that denominates them all *Independents*, though they otherwise differ one with another. 2. That *invidious name*, however disowned by them, was first of their own *invention*, and

See Anat. of Indep. p. 37, 38.

by

y practise, (as well as by the former doctrine) arrogated to themselves. 3. They all agree also in *separation from our Churches*; they *unchurch* our Churches, *unminister* our Ministers, &c. pag. 148. With such I deal. He asks, "*Is this Independentism a schism, properly so called?* "*I hope he did not expect, that I should* "*plead for it. I deny that I unminister* "*their Ministers, &c.* How he can with *conscience* deny this, of most of the *Sects* of *Independents*, I much wonder; not onely *Anabaptists*, but some of his own *way*, not yet gone so far, do *separate* from our Churches, *unminister* our Ministers, &c. And his own *principles* do the same, and will ere long lead him thither, as I have abundantly proved. But what means he by *Independentism*?

Pag. 149. "*If by Independentism* "*he understands, the peaceable proceed-* "*ding of any of the people of God, in* "*this Nation, in the severall parts* "*of it, to joyne themselves, by their* "*free consent, to walk together in the* "*observation of all the Ordinances of*

"*Christ,*

"*Christ appointed to be observed in*
"*particular Churches, so to reform*
"*themselves from some disorders*
"*wherein they were entangled, being*
"*not able in some things, to joyne*
"*in the presbyterian way of reforma-*
"*tion, without judging and condem-*
"*ning them, as to the whole of their*
"*station and Ordinances; when it shall*
"*be proved schism, it shall be attended*
"*to.* The like is repeated again, *pag.* 160. with some little difference; for such, onely he pleads. Now to speak in the reverend Doctors *mode*, I humbly beseech this *reverend Author*, seriously to consider, what he hath said, and whom he pleads for: 1. Whether he do not plead for all the *Sects* in the Nation, as to the *whole* of this, (except one *particular*, of which by and by)? Do they not all plead a *peaceable proceeding* of (*themselves*) the people of God, to joyne together by their *free consent*, to walk together in the *observation* of all the Ordinances, &c? to *reform* themselves from disorders, as not able

to

joyne in the way of *presbyterian* formation? &c. 2. Will he call that a *peacable* proceeding, which is done without the *authority* of the *Christian civill Magistrate*, and to the *disturbance* of all the Churches of the Nation? 3. Were it granted, that in the *first constitution* of a Church, people might, by their own *free consent*, joyne to walk together, &c. Is this course tolerable in *setled Churches*, without "*confusion*, and overthrowing of the *very* constitution of "*Churches*, &c? as he said elsewhere, *Duty of Pastor and People*, pag. 53. (to which I have spoken, in the end of my second Chapter above) unlesse he will deny us now to be *true Churches*. May not the *members* of his own Church, upon some *disorders* of it, (as they can easily conceive) have the same *liberty* to separate from them, and joyne by *free consent* together, to set up another Church? Nay, do they not take that

* So he seems to mean, pag. 160. when he speaks of Members of the Catholick Church, both invisible and visible, to be joyned in particular Churches.

that *liberty*? and notwithstanding all the bonds and fetters of *free consent* and *explicite covenant* to continue with them, *desert* them upon this very *principle*, and joyne themselves with *Anabaptists*, and other Sects? 4. And do they not all break the last condition, "*judging and condemning the* "*present way of reformation, as to the* "*whole of their station and Ordinan-* "*ces*? Will the reverend Doctor put out the eyes of all men, but his own?

Lastly, I leave it to his own consideration, whether it be lawful for people, that are members of *true Churches*, (as ours are acknowledged to be) upon some *disorders* in a Church, or preference of *reforming* themselves, to *separate* from that Church, and to erect another; when as they have done their *duty* to reform it, in those disorders; notwithstanding which, they may without sin, *communicate* with that Church?

Nothing but opposition to, in the way of performance of morall duties, can excuse the withdrawing from them, when occasion of enjoying is offered. Robinf. *Treat. of lawfulnesse of hearing English Ministers*, pag. 6. *See also* pag. 17. *and his Apol.* pag. 87.

Church? but rather to breake true Churches into pieces, than to bear with some inconveniences. And I desire a *president* of such a practise in Scripture or story.

Page. 156. "*When they and we began to reforme, thousands of the people of God in this nation, had no reason to suppose themselves to belong to one particular Church rather than another; they lived in one Parish, heard in another.* If they did not suppose themselves to be of some particular Church, it was their *error* and their *fault*; their *errour* because all the people of the Nation, were *confined* to that Church where they lived; and lyable to *censure* for leaving that Church, for partaking of Ordinances; and the *Ministers* for admitting them: Their *fault*, because they were bound by way of duty, both by the *Lawes* of the Nation, and also by the *Law* of God, to be of one or other *particular* Congregation; as the Reverend Doctor hath oft asserted; and this *disorder* to be of no *one* congregation, would not be indured in

any

any of their members. The *bonds* only was that they are obliged to be members, where the Ordinances were not at all or sinfully administred: In my eighth Chapter, he leapes over above twenty leaves at once.

Page. 154. I had said, our Churches under the *Prelates*, were not capable of *reduction* to the primitive institution; whereupon he professed "*he* "*could not looke upon such societies* "*as Churches of Christ.* Which (said I) was to *unchurch* all our Churches, since the *Reformation*: He answers, "*The Churches of ENGLAND were* "*capable of that reduction under the* "*Prelates, though in some things hin-* "*dered by them, from an actuall reduce-* "*ment.* Doth this become the Doctor's *ingenuity*? So are the Churches of *ROME* capable, *potentiâ remotâ*, to be reduced to the primitive institution: but so *hindered* by some body, that he that should go about it, would find the actually *uncapable* of such reducement: So are our Churches *capable* of such a reduction; and it is *probable*,

had

had been reduced to the primitive institution ere this, but he knows we have obstructed it: as I told him before: yea that, "*perfect liberty for reformation, or rather toleration of all "Religions*, is the greatest *Impediment* to our *Reformation*; and vvhilst it continues, will render us more uncapable of Reduction to the primitive institution: Whilst our people have so much *liberty* to be of any, or no *Religion*, no *Reformation* is possible; and yet vve are *potentially* capable of that reduction: And the Reverend Doctor's advice, given before and novv againe, *page.* 270. of *Schism*? "*that people take some other peaceable "way, to make themselves partakers of "those purchased priviledges, &c.* comes both too late, for they have done it already by *separation* from us; and also unreasonably, because if it be taken, it renders us more *uncapable* of that *Reformation* desired, by *withdrawing* the best and most reformed of our members from us, and leaves us but *few* beside those that hate to be reformed.

Page. 166. Beside the "*radicall*

"*union* (as he calls it, page. 96. of "Schism?) *of the Church Catholick:* "*invisible in it selfe, and with its* "*head*; there is (as he tells us also, pag. 97.) "*another consequentiall union,* "*with peculiar reference to the mem-* "*bers themselves, and that is the mutuall* "*love of all those united in the Head;* "*towards one another*, &c. Now though he cannot break the *radicall union* with the Head; he may breake the *consequentiall union* or consequence of that *union*, which consists in mutuall love. *Paul* and *Barnabas* fell into difference, and separation one from another; yet were, no doubt, true members of the *Invisible* Church, (though not of any *particular* Church) and this was at least some degree of *breach* of that mutuall *love* and *peace*, that ought to have been between them; hereupon it was that I said, "*unlesse the Reve-* "*rend Doctor think there are no mem-* "*bers of this Church in ENGLAND,* "*but these that are of his formed par-* "*ticular Congregations, I feare he* "*will be found to break the union, that* "*ought to be between them.* He is grie-

ved

ed he sayes, at this my declaration; "*because the union of the members of* "*this Church in this sense, consists in* "*their joynt union to, and with Christ* "*their head, by one spirit,* concealing the other, of *mutuall love*, which I intended: Now when the Reverend Doctor or some Churches of his *party*, have separated from some *whom* they acknowledge *truely godly*; and keep them out of communion with themselves, in their Churches, unless they will give a *consent* to be members of that Church, by an *explicite* covenant (he knowes where this was practised) I shall say again, here was a *breach of union*, that ought to be between the members of that catholick Church: It is not his saying, "*that he does not think, all the mem-* "*bers of that Church are comprised* "*in their Churches or ours*, that will help it (who made the first *division*, they *or* we, is well known): but it is the *deny all* of communion with such *members*, on the termes aforesaid, that breaks the union of *mutuall* love, between those members. *Page.*

Page. 167. I had said; By *gatherin* Saints of the greatest magnitude, the do what they can to make the *Invi sible* Church *visible*. He answers "*It is confessed we do so; This, with al* "*that lyes in us, we draw them unt* And truly, it is our care and indea your to make all our visible profes sours, invisible true *believers*: But this is not their way: They do not, (as we do) labour to make *bare pro fessours* (meere naturall men, of their own *Congregations*) to be reall belie vers for they pretend to admit none such, if they know them) but they *unreasonably* and unjustly gather, or rather steal, our best professours, and reall believers, to make a Church *vi sible*, of invisible members, a Church of all *elect* ones. Which course, as it is not to be exemplified in *all* Scrip ture, *or* storie; So it is *foretspoken* by Christ himself, not to be accompli shed; who hath told us, "*the* Wheate "*and the* Tares, *the* Goates *and the* "Sheep, *must be mixt together in the* "Church, *till the* great day *of finall* "*separation*? and we doubt not, but they

they find the *impossibility* of effecting that *designe*, when they and the *world* sees, they have in their Churches some *hypocrites*, and some as *loose*, as in some of ours: And their *arrogance*, in presuming against the *predictions* and *providence* of Christ, to *build* a Church, that should *reach* unto Heaven on Earth, hath been fearfully *blasted* (as another *Babel*) with *confusion*, by their members, falling into *damnable* errours, and *abhominable* profanenesse, as I said else-where. Even some *Independent* Churches, which he too much countenances, if he be not a *member* of them, may easily be proved, in his own judgment to be *hereticall*, if *Arminianism*, and some points of *Popery*, be with him accounted *Heresies*: I need not instance.

Pag. 168. "*As to the worship esta-*
"*blished in this Nation, for the sub-*
"*stantialls, we are all agreed in: I sup-*
"*pose, he will not say, a relinquishment*
"*of the practise of it, is a schism; if he*
"*do, I know what use some men will*
"*make of his affirmation, though I*

See p. 171. "*know not how he will free himself,* "*from being Schismaticall.* Truly, as easily, as the reverend Doctor can free himself from that charge of *schism.* We have not relinquished the *Worship*, established by Law, as to the *substantialls* of our Worship, (the *Episcopall* men joyne with us, and we with them therein) but in the *externall formalities*, and *ceremoniall circumstances* of that worship; which (as he saies somewhere) were *laid aside by other hands.* But they renounce *communion* with us, in the *substantialls* of worship, and erect other *Churches*; and that we judge to be *schismaticall.*

Pag. 169. "*When most of us receiv-* "*ved our new birth in* England, "*through the preaching of the Word,* "*neither they nor we, as to the pra-* "*ctise of our waies, were in* England. For *them* indeed, the practise of their *wayes* of separation, were not in *England*; but our way of *parochiall* Congregations, and the *substantialls* of our Worship, in the Word *preached*, whereby they were *regenera-*

ted;

ted; and the Sacraments *administred*, whereby they were *nourished*; were then in *England* as much as now: Yet from these they *separate*, and deny *communion* with us. For the *successe* of their *Ministry*, as *Independents*, I see little fruit of it, but *schism* and separation; nor can they look for any, as *Ministers*; all their *gathered members*, being before converted, (as they suppose and desire) by our *Ministry*: See *Anat. of Indep. p.* 25 *f.*

Pag. 172. "*That in* England, "*under the Prelates, there were true* "*Churches, and true Ministers,* "*though in much disorder, as to the* "*way of entring into the Ministry, and* "*dispencing of Ordinances, I freely* "*grant.* Which were they? That he tells us, *pag.* 173. "*Here I let him* "*know, that I assent unto that summe* "*of all that he hath to say; namely,* "(which were my words) *that the* "*true and faithfull Ministers, with* "*the people in their severall Congre-* "*gations, administring the true Ordi-* "*nances of Jesus Christ, whereof Bap-*

"tism *is one, was, and is, the true* "*Church-state of* England, *from* "*which I am not separated.* Who would not think, the reverend Doctor were a *Convert*, from the way of *Independentism*, acknowledging all this, and denying separation? Will all *Independents* yield thus much? Can many of them say, They are not *separated*? What *reserve* the reverend Doctor hath, that he is not yet *entred a member* into one of their Churches, or that he hath not *totally* renounced his *Ordination*, (and that but for some *disorder* onely, or some addition of human *prudence*, in his *entrance* into the *Ministry*) or lastly, that he sees some *weakneſſe*, if not *falſneſſe*, in his *principles*; "*That ſuc-* "*ceſſive Ordination from* Rome, *as* "*a Church, is Antichriſtian, as from* "*the Beaſt*, I cannot tell, nor *wiſer* men then I; but sure we are, that most *Independents* are of another mind, and will not thank him for these *conceſſions*, being not able to justifie their *ſeparation* from our Churches, if all the reverend Doctor hath said, be true. *Pag.*

Pag. 147. Yet he saies, "*It is incumbent on this Author, to prove, that we have been members of some of those particular Churches, in due order, according to the mind of Christ, to all intents and purposes of Church-membership; and that we have in our individuall persons, raised causelesse differences, in those particular Churches, and so separated from them, with the condemnation of them.* I promise you, this will be an *hard labour*, having so many things to prove at once, of the same men; when if I prove not some *one particular*, he will still *deny* the whole. But since the reverend Doctor puts *himself* amongst them, I doubt not, but to make all good upon his *party*, (they made the *division* into parties) if not upon himself. First, upon his acknowledgment afore, that our *particular* Congregations, were, and are, *true* Churches, it is evident, that they have been *members* (yea, some of them *Ministers*) of our particular Churches, or of none. 2. For the *due order* of being made so, I hope, some little *disorder* in

in the *institutions* of Christ, does not make a *nullity* in them, though he explains not what he means by *order*. 3. *According to the mind of Christ.* As for *substantialls*, we can affirm it, if not in *circumstantialls*, wherein scarce any *Church* on earth will be found faultlesse. 4. "*To the* "*intents and purposes of Church-mem-*"*bership.* Surely our *Christianity*, and covenant in *Baptism*, bound us to all the *duties* of Church-membership, though we may *fail*, as to performance of them. 5. "*That, in their* "*individuall persons, they have many* "*of them, actually, or really, by sepa-*"*ration, raised differences in our* "*Churches, whereof they were mem-*"*bers*; is too evident to be denyed, by *conscientious* men. 6. That they (many of them, whatever the reverend Doctor hath done) have *separated* from us; *renounced communion* with us; is as clearly evident. 7. "*And that with condemnation of* "*our Churches, as Antichristian, &c.* is also too *notorious* to be denyed. And then the conclusion followes.

Pag.

Pag. 176. I said, the reverend Doctor, by his *indulgence* of liberty to all men, to follow their own *light*, in submitting to any way of *Religion*, seemed to me to be a *Scepticke*, in his way of *Independency*. He asks; "*Why so? this will gratifie all Sects, Quakers and all, with a toleration: How, I pray? It is schism, not toleration, we are treating about.* Where the reverend Doctor *confounds* what I disowned: He first seems to be a *Scepticke*, (which I prove by that which follows, Does he believe his own way to be the onely true way of Christ, and yet tolerate other waies?) or he seems to gratifie all Sects, *Quakers, &c.* with a toleration, and leaves them to *judge*, what is, or is not, according to the *mind* of Christ, &c. To which he saies, "*Pray, Sir, who is appointed to judge finally for them? why then should they be denyed their liberty?* May he not say as much for *Popery*, *Anabaptism*, or any *Sect*, and so grant an *universall* toleration, (which he seems to do, in his *Epistle* to his *Sermon*, before the last

Session

Session of Parliament; Who is
pointed to *judge finally* for the
why then should they be den
their *liberty*?) He must remem
we are not speaking of *circumst*
alls, about the worship of Go
wherein severall *Churches* may diff
without *schism*; but of the *subst*
tialls of Doctrine, Worship, and D
cipline, prescribed by Christ in t
Gospell, which are of *necessary obse*
vation, for all Christians. And
Christ hath limited all to one *Tr*
one way of *Worship*, one *Discipline*
(as we both suppose he hath) ce
tainly every man is bound to get in
to that *way* of Christ, and not left t
his *own light*, to judge finally fo
himself, or to *chuse* or *refuse* a w
of Christ, by his own liberty; an
may be *compelled* to the externa
profession of *Christs* way, in all thos
particulars, which utterly destroye
his *toleration*. What answers he to m
question? Thus: "*How if I shou*
"*say, that our way, and their way, for*
"*the substance of them, is one way*?
But so he might have said of *thei*
way,

way, and the *Episcopall* way, for the *substantialls* of Religion, they were one way; and yet I suppose, he will not grant the *members* of his Church, *liberty*, to judge of, and to *chuse* the *Episcopall* way; or if our *way* and theirs be neerer one another, he will hardly grant them *liberty*, to come into *our way*, because he judges "*their* "*way, to be according to the mind of* "*Christ, and not ours*; *pag.* 178. And this, he saies, he is ready *personally to maintain* to me. But why doth he not publickly *discover* and *maintain* this, to all the *Churches* of the Nation, before he set upon the *practise* of it? and puts us off with *delayes* and *designes* in hand; which when we shall see, we know not. That he hath run from *severall* waies, is not to be gain-said, from *Episcopall* to *Presbyterian*, from that, to *Independentism*, &c. is no *calumny*, though it may be to his *reproach*, which I cannot help. If his way be the onely *way* of Christ, I asked, if every man be not *bound* to come unto it, and not upon any conceired *new light* to relinquish it? He answers; "*Truly I think* M. C. "*him-*

They (of N. Eng.) answered, They could not grant any form of Government, but one, seeing there is but one way laid down in the Word, and that unchangeable.

Answ. to 32. *Quest.*

himself is bound to come into it
(surely not till he give me better
light, that it is the way of Christ
yet I do not think, that his not-join-
ing makes him a schismatick. But
if I were convinced, that it was the
onely way of Christ, I should think
my self *schismaticall*, in not submit-
ting to it; as I do him, for *renouncing*
the *Presbyterian* way, which once he
was *convinced* of, to be the *way* of
Christ. However, it concerns him
most, in the *alteration* of his judg-
ment and practise, to demonstrate
clearly, his is the *way* of Christ, and
not ours, or else we shall judge him
schismaticall in that *separation*. This
he *promises* again and again, *pag.* 163.
and 181. in his conclusion of all: In
expectation and earnest desire where-
of, I rest.

MUSEUM
BRITANNICUM

FINIS.